COL-HO5894-6-KP1451

JE

The Journal of Higher Education

6

LEONARD L. BAIRD, *Editor*

Editorial Board

DARYL G. SMITH, *Chairperson, The Claremont Graduate School*

ALBERTO F. CABRERA, *State University of New York — Albany*

KENNETH A. FELDMAN, *State University of New York — Stony Brook*

MILDRED GARCIA, *Montclair State University*

PATRICIA J. GUMPORT, *Stanford University*

JAMES C. HEARN, *University of Georgia*

KATHRYN M. MOORE, *Michigan State University*

AMAURY NORA, *University of Houston*

NANCY L. ZIMPHER, *Dean, College of Education Ohio State University, ex officio*

RICHARD SISSON, *Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, Ohio State University, ex officio*

RUSSELL EDGERTON, *President, American Association for Higher Education, ex officio*

LEONARD L. BAIRD, *Ohio State University, ex officio*

Copyright © 1996 by the Ohio State University Press
All Rights Reserved

KP 1451

378
5826

Journal of Higher Education. (ISSN 0022-1546) Published bimonthly by the Ohio State University Press. Margaret Starbuck, Managing Editor; Bertina Povenmire, Production Editor; Melodie McGrothers, Subscriptions Manager. Publishing and advertising offices: Ohio State University Press, 1070 Carmack Road, Columbus, Ohio 43210. Periodicals postage paid at Columbus, Ohio, and at additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to: *Journal of Higher Education*, Ohio State University Press, 1070 Carmack Road, Columbus, Ohio 43210.

Subscriptions. Libraries and other institutions, $75.00; individuals, $35.00; association member discount $24.00; students, $24.00. Outside U.S. add $6.00 postage. Orders and remittances should be sent to the Ohio State University Press, 1070 Carmack Road, Columbus, Ohio 43210. Claims on undelivered copies must be made within four months of the date of publication. Allow six weeks for address changes.

Back Issues, Reprints, Microfilms. Most back issues from 1987 to the present are available from the Ohio State University Press. Price per copy $6.00. Payment must accompany order. Reprints of individual articles, reprints of out-of-print issues, and microfilms of back volumes are available from University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106.

Manuscripts. Articles submitted for publication should meet the requirements set forth in *JHE*'s Instructions to Contributors. Original typescript and two duplicates should be sent to: Leonard L. Baird, Editor, *Journal of Higher Education*, Ohio State University Press, 1070 Carmack Road, Columbus, Ohio 43210. Unsolicited manuscripts should be accompanied by a stamped, return-mail envelope.

Abstracts and Indexes. *Abstracted in Academic Abstracts, Academic Librarianship, Educational Administration Abstracts, ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Information Access Co., Political Science Abstracts, Psychological Abstracts, Readers Guide to Periodical Literature, Social Science Source, Social Work Research and Abstracts, and Society for Research into Higher Education. Indexed in Arts & Humanities Citation Index, Bibliographic Index, Book Review Index, Education Index, and Social Sciences Citation Index.*

Copyright © 1996 by the Ohio State University Press. All rights reserved. Article copying exclusively for personal or internal use, or for the personal use of specific clients, is permitted provided that the copy user or producer pay a fee of $2.00 per copy of any article, comment, book review, or other complete unit to the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. This limited permission does not extend to other kinds of copying, such as copying for general distribution, for resale, for creating new collective works, or for advertising and promotion purposes. Specific written permission for such copying must be obtained from the Ohio State University Press. Code: 0022-1546/96 $2.00 + 0 ∞

KP - 1451

JHE November/December 1996
Vol. 67, No. 6

The Journal of Higher Education

JOHN M. BRAXTON, MARDY T. EIMERS and ALAN E. BAYER 603

The Implications of Teaching Norms for the Improvement of Undergraduate Education

Because suggestions for improving undergraduate education are unlikely to be enacted by faculty if requisite norms are not present, we examined six recommendations from the literature to determine whether the corresponding prevailing norms were endorsed by faculty members. Norms were found to be extant for three of the recommendations, but they were largely absent for the other three, which would therefore require strong personal control for successful implementation.

GARY RHOADES 626

Reorganizing the Faculty Workforce for Flexibility: Part-Time Professional Labor

This article addresses professional workforce issues related to part-time faculty in unionized institutions. Collective bargaining agreements of 183 institutions/systems in the 1990s are content analyzed. I find extensive managerial discretion and limited professional constraints regarding the use of part-time faculty, in appointment/release workforce actions such as retrenchment and the ratio of part-time to full-time faculty.

GLEN J. GODWIN and WILLIAM T. MARKHAM 660

First Encounters of the Bureaucratic Kind: Early Freshman Experiences with a Campus Bureaucracy

This research draws on observation and interview data to examine traditional-age freshmen's early encounters with a campus bureaucracy, focusing on their definitions and coping strategies. Though frustrated by lines, impersonal treatment, and "runarounds," most freshmen accepted the bureaucracy with superficial equanimity. This research helps explain how bureaucracies continue to function despite inherent strains and differences in client and staff perspectives and goals.

ALLYSON FIONA HADWIN and PHILIP H. WINNE 692

Study Strategies Have Meager Support: A Review with Recommendations for Implementation

We reviewed studies that investigate the effects of teaching study tactics in situations where students could choose whether to use those study methods in everyday courses.

Research was sparse; among studies that meet rigorous criteria, none investigated whether students could adapt study tactics beyond the training context. We withhold strong recommendations in favor of tentative implications for research and practice.

BOOK REVIEWS

Faculty at Work: Motivation, Expectation, Satisfaction, by Robert T. Blackburn and Janet H. Lawrence
REVIEWED BY GERHARD SONNERT 716

The Research University in a Time of Discontent, edited by Jonathan R. Cole, Elinor G. Barber, and Stephen R. Graubard
REVIEWED BY EDWARD J. HACKETT 718

ANNUAL INDEX 721

Cover: Around the Verne, Copyright by Larry Hamill

Copyright 1996 by the Ohio State University Press

John M. Braxton
Mardy T. Eimers
Alan E. Bayer

The Implications of Teaching Norms for the Improvement of Undergraduate Education

Undergraduate education in our colleges and universities continues to gain considerable attention from a number of groups — state legislatures, students, national associations, faculty, administrators, and parents. Consequently, studies by national associations and independent scholars have increasingly addressed the issue of improving undergraduate education. In fact, many of these publications come to a remarkable consensus concerning the initiatives that might be implemented to enhance the undergraduate student's academic experience. For example, it is not difficult to find recommendations that have encouraged more in- and out-of-class interaction between students and faculty, called for faculty members to provide students with more formative feedback on assignments, or urged faculty to employ multiple modes of evaluating student performance. Other reports have suggested that undergraduates deserve systematic advising, that students need to cultivate more out-of-classroom learning experiences, and that, in general, administrators and faculty should continually strive to improve undergraduate education within their institutions.

It is, nevertheless, one thing to make recommendations and quite another to implement them successfully. In this study we maintain that the

An earlier version of this article was presented as part of the Symposium "Social Influences on College Teaching" at the 1992 annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education in Minneapolis, Minnesota, 28 October to 1 November 1992.

John M. Braxton is an associate professor in the Department of Educational Leadership at Vanderbilt University, Mardy T. Eimers is a research analyst in the Office of Planning and Budget at the University of Missouri System, Columbia, Missouri, and Alan E. Bayer is a professor of sociology and director of the Center for Survey Research at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 67, No. 6 (November/December 1996)
Copyright 1996 by the Ohio State University Press

successful implementation of any improvement in undergraduate education depends, to a significant extent, on the existence of "norms" supportive of these initiatives. That is, a recommendation to improve undergraduate education is more likely to be implemented by faculty if norms, or group standards of appropriate and inappropriate behavior, support the recommendation. Because this study focuses primarily on the teaching dimension of undergraduate education, norms become particularly salient as faculty have considerable autonomy and can enact teaching recommendations according to their own preferences. Thus, if norms support a given recommendation, a faculty member is more likely to enact it; however, if little normative support for a given recommendation exists among the faculty, then it is less likely to be endorsed.

Research Questions

This study focuses on the norms espoused by faculty and the question whether these norms do or do not support efforts to improve undergraduate education. We believed that the most appropriate method to determine the answer to this question was first to identify specific recommendations that have been advocated to improve undergraduate education. If specific recommendations could be identified, we could then ascertain whether a normative structure supports teaching improvement efforts. We identified six such undergraduate teaching improvement recommendations that have been advanced in recent years by the higher education community. These recommendations, frequently cited by national studies and independent authors, are formally introduced later in this article. In relation to these recommendations, the questions for this research are twofold:

1. Are faculty norms present to support recommendations that have been suggested to improve undergraduate education?
2. If faculty norms do support these recommendations, then do these norms vary across different types of academic institutions and different academic disciplines?

This study is important for several reasons. First, little or no research has been conducted in this area. Braxton, Bayer, and Finkelstein [9] identified a normative structure for undergraduate college teaching — four domains characterized in the negative as Interpersonal Disregard, Particularistic Grading, Moral Turpitude, and Inadequate Planning — but this research did not focus on the research questions addressed above. Likewise, it is well documented that improving undergraduate teaching at our colleges and universities has been a long-standing chal-

lenge; unfortunately, real progress has been questionable. Thus, investigating how norms may enhance or inhibit the process of improving undergraduate education is warranted. Second, knowing if norms support a given teaching recommendation may fortify an institution's efforts to implement that recommendation. Third, if norms are in place for some recommendations but not for others, different strategies for different recommendations may be necessary. Similarly, if norms support the recommendations in one institutional or disciplinary context but not in another, different strategies may be necessary depending on the affiliation of the faculty members.

Understanding Norms

Norms are shared beliefs within a social or professional group of what behavior ought to be in a given situation or circumstance [20, 36]. Merton [30, 31] defined norms as prescribed and proscribed patterns of behavior. That is, because norms are shared evaluations of prescribed or proscribed behavior, they have a direct influence on the behavior of the individuals within the social unit. In our research context, individual institutions may promulgate policies or develop programs to improve undergraduate education. And the faculty, in part because of the autonomy they enjoy, generally have the freedom to accept or reject these teaching improvement programs. However, their acceptance or rejection of these programs will depend significantly on whether faculty norms support or rebuff the recommendations.

The focus on norms emanates from Durkheim's [15] supposition that nonconformity is the normal human condition and that conformity is abnormal. Durkheim's assertion is reinforced by the high degree of autonomy faculty have in teaching role performance. Hence, norms are necessary to assure conformity [34], and conformity is essential for the recommendations to be realized throughout an institution such as a college or university.

Thus far we have established a framework from which the research questions can be approached; we have also provided a rationale for pursuing these questions. The next section introduces six recommendations found in the literature to improve undergraduate education. In this section the specific reports are also briefly discussed.

Recommendations to Improve Undergraduate Education

Review of Published Studies

To identify the recommendations, the literature was classified into four categories. This approach helped to ensure that various publica-

tions on improving undergraduate education, written for different purposes and diverse audiences, were considered. These categories, nevertheless, should not be perceived as being mutually exclusive or as categories into which all of the teaching improvement literature can be neatly placed. The four categories are: (a) published studies offering specific recommendations to improve teaching and learning, (b) studies offering recommendations to improve the undergraduate curriculum, (c) studies suggesting organizational approaches to improve undergraduate teaching and learning, and (d) studies that comprehensively examine means to improve the undergraduate academic experience.

The first category includes analyses that identify specific recommendations to enhance undergraduate teaching and learning. *Teaching Tips: A Guide for the Beginning College Teacher* [29], *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education* [10], *Involvement in Learning* [32], and *Teaching Based on Knowledge of Students* [23] can be considered in this category. Moreover, a handful of articles that center on specific teaching enhancement practices are included [27, among others]. These reports have provided the most appropriate and practical recommendations for this study, because they focus largely on how individual faculty members can improve their own teaching.

Publications in the second category focus on how to enhance the undergraduate curriculum. However, discussing the content and structure of the curriculum is almost impossible without addressing how the curriculum should be delivered. Thus the authors often go beyond discussion of curriculum reform and include recommendations for enhancing undergraduate teaching and learning. Reports in this category include *New Life for the College Curriculum* [19] and *Integrity in the College Curriculum: A Report to the Academic Community* [1].

Improving College Teaching [39] and *Improving Undergraduate Education through Faculty Development* [17] are representative of the third category, organizational approaches to improving undergraduate teaching. *Scholarship Reconsidered* is also included in this category because of the elevated import Boyer [8] brings to the role of teaching. These publications provide administrators and faculty with specific approaches to improving or heightening the relative worth of undergraduate teaching within the context of a given institution.

Comprehensive reports, such as *The Quest for Quality* [28], *The Undergraduate Experience in America* [7], and *Higher Learning* [5] comprise the fourth category. These publications not only offer specific recommendations for improving undergraduate teaching and learning but also address curriculum, faculty development, and a host of other issues.

Focal Recommendations

From the categories above, a common set of six recommendations to improve undergraduate teaching and learning can be discerned. We do not imply that these recommendations are the only ones, nor do we suggest that each recommendation is supported by every published report we reviewed. We do, however, ensure that multiple authors had supported each of the recommendations. For the recommendations listed below, our research was further guided by the availability of data on faculty perceptions of prevailing norms related to each of the six recommendations.

Encouragement of faculty and student contact. Enhancing the quality and frequency of faculty-student interaction in and out of the classroom has received nearly universal support as a means to fortify the college experience for undergraduate students [7, 11, 17, 28, 32]. In *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education,* Chickering and Gamson [11] specifically identified "encouraging student-faculty contact" as one of seven principles. The authors suggested that "frequent student-faculty contact in and out of classes is the most important factor in student motivation and involvement" and that "knowing a few faculty members well enhances students' intellectual commitment and encourages them to think about their own values and future plans." Faculty members who make themselves available to students, especially outside of scheduled class time, provide students with additional opportunities to develop academically and socially.

Systematic program of advisement. "Systematic advisement" refers to the recommendation that students be advised on formal academic and personal issues in a regular and consistent manner. This includes, for example, advising students in course and major selection, helping students determine out-of-class activities that might enhance their college experience, and counseling students in their career decisions. Boyer [7], National Institute of Education [32], Gaff [19] and Mayhew, Ford, and Hubbard [28] all highlight the need for students to have regular and systematic advisement. The National Institute of Education [32] recommended that students be provided with "one individual who follows the student through the college career." In cases where an issue is outside of a faculty member's expertise, possible campus resources and personnel that the student can seek out should be recommended by the faculty advisor.

Feedback on student performance. A common and universal recommendation, seldom overlooked in any composite report on enhancing undergraduate education, includes reference to providing frequent, prompt, and constructive feedback on student performance. "Students

need frequent opportunities to perform and receive suggestions for improvement" [11]; faculty should provide multiple methods and multiple opportunities to assess student performance [27]; "faculty members should give students prompt and ample feedback on their papers and exams in order to help them understand what constitutes superior performance and where their own strengths and weaknesses lie" [5]; and "[students also have every reason to expect that] the tests and papers that are a part of the learning process will be fairly graded, promptly returned, and provided with helpful comment by the instructor" [1].

Learn about students. One opportunity to improve college teaching is to encourage faculty to learn more about their students [17, 19, 23]. Katz [23] posited that effective teaching hinges largely on recognizing and learning the student interests and characteristics in one's class and then using examples and giving assignments based on these interests and characteristics. Mancini, Billson, and Tiberius [27] suggest that faculty should learn about their students, and students about them, during the first few class sessions. This includes learning the names of students, especially in small and medium-sized classes. "Unless teachers know their students reasonably well, it is impossible for them to know whether or how any given idea will be understood, integrated into the mind, or used by the student" [19]. Faculty who learn the needs of students and use this information to enhance communication in the classroom can also contribute to undergraduate students' motivation to learn.

Foster egalitarianism and tolerance in the classroom. Faculty are encouraged to respect and foster a climate of egalitarianism and tolerance in the classroom. This recommendation points to a number of specific and collective recommendations faculty members are advised to consider. For instance, the diverse backgrounds and interests students bring to a class adds to the "richness of classroom interaction" and should be celebrated and used as vehicles for learning [27]. A situation in which students hesitate to participate in classroom discussions because their views are openly criticized by faculty members only serves to inhibit a free exchange of ideas and to hamper the opportunity — for students and instructors alike — to learn from each other [19]. Reinforcing an open exchange of ideas among all members of a class also encourages students to take a more active and responsible role for their own learning.

Demonstration of a concern for improving college teaching. A central theme, either implied or explicit, suggests that faculty members take actions that enhance their own skills as an undergraduate teacher [7, 8, 17, 19, 28]. Boyer [7] recommends that faculty members remain "students" — not only in terms of keeping active in their disciplines but also in terms of understanding more about how students learn — and

that they experiment with new teaching techniques and improve how they assess student academic performance. Eble and McKeachie [17] concur: "The ability to analyze the teaching situation, to monitor one's own effectiveness, and to adapt one's methods to a particular class and a particular teaching situation are elements in continuing development as a faculty member." Because faculty have little formal training in college teaching and student learning, genuine attempts that couple their own teaching experience with new teaching strategies are strongly encouraged.

Methods

Sampling Design

This inquiry uses a subset of the data collected by Braxton, Bayer, and Finkelstein [9] in their research which identified a normative structure for undergraduate college teaching. For the current study the population of inference included tenured, full-time faculty in the academic subject matter areas of biology, history, mathematics, and psychology holding academic appointments at Research I Universities (RI universities) and Comprehensive Universities and Colleges II (CUCII institutions) categories of the Carnegie Classification of Institutions [10]. These two categories of higher education institutions were selected because they represent institutions that vary on the level of degrees offered and the extensiveness of their missions [10]. More specifically, RI universities offer not only a full range of undergraduate degree programs and award the doctoral degree, they also give a high priority to research. In contrast, CUCII institutions offer graduate education through to the master's degree and award more than half of their bachelor's degrees in occupational or professional fields such as engineering or business administration. Emphasis at CUCII institutions is more on teaching and less on research than is true of RI universities. Because of such differences, we might expect norms that support the six selected recommendations to differ between faculty members in these two types of institutions.

The academic disciplines of biology, mathematics, history, and psychology were selected because they represent different categories of the Biglan schema for the classification of academic subject matter areas [3]. The disciplines included in this study represent the following categories of Biglan's schema: hard-life (biology), hard-nonlife (mathematics), soft-life (psychology), and soft-nonlife (history). These disciplinary categories were represented in this study because norms that support the six recommendations may vary across these four categories.

Research has indicated that departmental goals, preferences toward teaching or research, scholarly or research productivity, and the amount of time invested in various professorial roles vary across the dimensions of the Biglan classification system [13].

Only tenured, full-time faculty were included in the present study. Tenured faculty are more likely to have a greater degree of autonomy in their teaching role performance and also in the implementation of various policies, procedures, and programs designed to improve undergraduate education. Moreover, those who are tenured have generally been in the teaching role sufficiently long to have crystallized their normative standards.

A cluster sampling design was used in this research. This design involved the random selection of specific institutions from the RI and the CUCII categories of the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education [10]. Because of the relative differences in the number of institutions of each type in the population and the relative number of faculty in selected departments, the sampling ratio for RI universities was slightly higher than the sampling ratio for CUCII institutions. From the population of 70 institutions classified as RI universities, 11 universities were selected at random; 25 institutions were drawn at random from the population of 171 CUCII institutions. The faculty sample was developed by obtaining the specific names of faculty from the most recent university and college catalogues of the randomly chosen institutions. Institutions in each category continued to be randomly selected until a minimum of 100 faculty members in the smaller of four selected discipline departments was attained. Random selection of faculty names was then employed to net 100 in each department for each of the two categories of institutions, yielding a random sample of 800 cases. All faculty holding the rank of assistant professor or higher and listed under one of the four academic departments represented in this inquiry had the possibility of being randomly chosen.[1]

The "College Teaching Behaviors Inventory" included an extensive compilation of specific teaching-related behaviors that might be considered as normative prescriptions by some members of the professoriate. This instrument was mailed to a randomly drawn sample of 799 faculty members in April 1989.[2] After an initial mailing, a postcard reminder, and a second mailing of the survey form to nonrespondents, a total of 356 individuals returned completed surveys. However, in order to meet the criteria for selection introduced earlier in this section, we used a subset of this sample comprised of 253 faculty respondents.

Analyses of variance by groups of mailings to nonrespondents indi-

cated no bias on the specific behaviors that represented the six recommendations to improve undergraduate education. Three groups of respondents were employed for a one-way analyses of variance. These three groups were respondents to the initial mailing of the Inventory, individuals who responded after the postcard reminder, and individuals who responded after the second mailing of the Inventory. This method of determining the representativeness of an obtained sample is consistent with procedures described by Goode and Hatt [21] and Leslie [26].

The College Teaching Behaviors Inventory

The "College Teaching Behaviors Inventory" was designed and constructed by Braxton, Bayer, and Finkelstein [9] as an exploratory instrument to identify undergraduate college teaching behaviors that are subject to normative criteria. The instrument contained 126 specific teaching behaviors. These behaviors represented categories of undergraduate teaching such as in- and out-of-class practices, examination and grading procedures, course planning and design, the first day of class, the instructor's relationship with colleagues, and faculty-student interaction.[3] The specific behaviors were gleaned from the literature on ethics in college teaching [2, 35, 37, 38, 40]. Suggestions from a panel of 23 experts on college teaching (members of the Project on Teaching of the American Sociological Association) were also used to generate the behaviors included in the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory.[4]

Research Design

Three sets of variables were employed in the research design: institutional type, academic discipline, and the teaching behaviors that represent the six recommendations to improve undergraduate education. Institutional type was composed of two categories: CUCII institutions and RI universities. The academic discipline variable included four different disciplines selected to represent different cells in the Biglan [3] classification of disciplines: biology, history, mathematics, and psychology. The variable set teaching behaviors included six variables that corresponded to the six selected recommendations for improving undergraduate education. These variables were: faculty-student contact, program of advisement, performance feedback, learning about students, classroom climate, and improving teaching. Each variable was a composite measure of a faculty member's reaction to a set of teaching behaviors, selected from the Inventory, for each of the six recommendations. Moreover, each of these behaviors was negatively worded to put it in the form of a violation of a possible norm. This method follows the contention of both Durkheim [14] and Kitsuse [25] that norms are

best recognized when they are violated. The sets of statements used in relation to each of the six selected recommendations regarding teaching are shown in Table 1.

Individuals were asked to indicate their opinion on each specific behavior as it might ideally apply to a faculty member teaching a lower division college course of about 40 enrolled students, regardless of whether the individuals taught such a course themselves. Individual faculty reactions to each of the specific behaviors were indicated by the use of the following 5-point rating scale: (1) appropriate behavior, should be encouraged, (2) discretionary behavior, neither particularly appropriate nor inappropriate, (3) mildly inappropriate, generally to be ignored, (4) inappropriate behavior, to be handled informally by colleagues or administrators suggesting change or improvement, and (5) very inappropriate behavior, requiring formal administrative intervention.

To construct each of the six composite variables, responses to each of the specific teaching behaviors were summed, and a mean value of these summations was computed. Because norms are standards or evaluations of conduct [20, 30, 31, 36], the degree of impropriety faculty members accord teaching behaviors that are dysfunctional to improving undergraduate education provides an appropriate operational definition of a norm for this inquiry. The teaching behaviors were stated as a violation of a potential norm and the possible level of associated sanctioning actions. By having faculty members ascribe sanctions to inappropriate teaching behaviors, we followed the Durkheimian principle of indexing the degree of moral indignation or outrage evoked by a violation of a norm through the type of sanction individuals believe might be allocated for such deviance [14, 41, 42].

Only those behaviors for which relatively strong sanctions (mean value of 3.5 or higher on the scale described above) were judged to be suitable to be designated as a norm. A mean value of 3.5 suggests not only that respondents' think a behavior is inappropriate (3.00) but that they perceive it to be above the level at which a behavior can be ignored. Moreover, more variability in the underlying distribution of the six dependent variables is afforded than if a 4.00 criterion were applied, as in the research by Braxton, Bayer, and Finkelstein [9].

Data Analysis

We used two different statistical procedures to address the two research questions. For the first research question we used the mean values of the six teaching behavior variables to determine whether or not these particular patterns of behavior met the definition of a norm. The means and standard deviations for the six variables are exhibited in

TABLE 1

Teaching Behaviors Instrumental to the Achievement of the Six Recommendations to Improve Undergraduate Education

Encouragement of Faculty and Student Contact (Faculty-Student Contact)
(Cronbach's alpha = 0.53)
Violations:
- Office hours scheduled for student appointments are frequently not kept.
- A faculty member avoids spending time with students outside of class time and/or regular office hours.
- A faculty member insists that they never be phoned at home by students regardless of circumstances.

Systematic Program of Advisement (Program of Advisement)
(Cronbach's alpha = 0.72)
Violations:
- A faculty member does not refer a student with a special problem to the appropriate campus service.
- An advisee is treated in a condescending manner.
- A faculty member avoids giving career or job advice when asked by students.
- A faculty member refuses to advise departmental majors.

Feedback on Student Performance (Performance Feedback)
(Cronbach's alpha = 0.75)
Violations:
- Graded tests and papers are not promptly returned to students by the instructor.
- Explanation of the basis for grades given for essay questions or papers is not provided to students.
- Written comments on tests and papers are consistently not made by the instructor.

Learn about Students (Learn about Students)
(Cronbach's alpha = 0.42)
Violations:
- Students are not asked to record their background, experiences, and interests for reference by the instructor.
- The instructor does not learn the names of all students in the class.

Foster Egalitarianism and Tolerance in the Classroom (Classroom Climate)
(Cronbach's alpha = 0.62)
Violations:
- The instructor insists that the student take one particular perspective on course content.
- Students are not permitted to express viewpoints different from those of the instructor.
- The instructor does not allow students to direct their comments to other members of the class.

Demonstration of a Concern for the Improving of College Teaching (Improving Teaching)
(Cronbach's alpha = 0.79)
Violations:
- A faculty member avoids reading literature on teaching techniques or methods.
- A faculty member avoids professional development opportunities that would enhance his or her teaching.
- The instructor does not introduce new teaching methods or procedures.

NOTE: These behaviors are negatively worded because of the method for identifying norms used in this study. See text for discussion.

The following code was provided for respondents to indicate their reactions to these behaviors: (1) appropriate behavior, should be encouraged, (2) discretionary behavior, neither particularly appropriate nor inappropriate, (3) mildly inappropriate behavior, generally to be ignored, (4) inappropriate behavior, to be handled informally by colleagues or administrators suggesting change or improvement, and (5) very inappropriate behavior, requiring formal administrative intervention.

Table 2. For the second research question we executed six analyses of variance (ANOVA), one for each composite variable, to ascertain whether identified norms vary across different types of colleges and universities and different academic disciplines. The two factors of these ANOVAs were: Institutional Type and Academic Discipline.[5] The 0.025 level of statistical significance was applied.[6] Following statistically significant main effects, we used the Least Significant Difference (LSD) method to conduct post-hoc mean comparisons. The summary statistics for these analyses of variance are contained in Table 3.

Findings

Question One: Normative Existence

We learn that norms (accompanied by sanctions) clearly exist — based on the 3.5 mean criterion — for three of the six recommendations to improve undergraduate education (see Table 2). These recommendations are "systematic program of advisement," "feedback on student performance," and "fostering an egalitarian and tolerant classroom climate."

Question Two: Variation in Normative Existence

Although norms appear to exist for "systematic program of advisement," "feedback on student performance," and "fostering an egalitarian and tolerant classroom climate," it is possible that any one of these norms may not be present in either CUCII institutions or RI universities. These norms also may not be universally present in biology, history, mathematics, and psychology. Furthermore, it is possible that a norm supportive of the other three recommendations may exist within any of these institutional and disciplinary contexts. The recommendation "encouraging faculty-student contact" is such a possibility, given its mean of 3.24. Thus, we conducted six analyses of variance in order to address these possibilities.

From Table 3, we observe either statistically significant main or interaction effects for two of the three recommendations supported by norms: "systematic program of advisement" and "egalitarian and tolerant classroom climate." Because a statistically significant interaction between Institutional Type and Academic Discipline was detected for "systematic program of advisement," we interpreted this interaction by conducting two ANOVAs. An ANOVA was executed for RI universities and for CUCII institutions. The factor for both ANOVAs was Academic Discipline. Only the ANOVA for RI universities was statistically significant.[7] Post-hoc mean comparisons among the four academic disci-

TABLE 2

Means and Standard Deviations for the Six Teaching Behaviors by All Faculty, Institutional Type, and Academic Discipline

	Faculty-Student Contact		Program of Advisement		Performance Feedback		Learn about Students		Classroom Climate		Improving Teaching	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
All Faculty	3.24	0.66	3.81	0.64	3.66	0.69	2.40	0.59	3.56	0.68	2.92	0.77
Institutional Type												
Research I	3.07	0.57	3.57	0.59	3.54	0.64	2.22	0.45	3.44	0.64	2.62	0.66
CUCII	3.30	0.71	4.01	0.60	3.75	0.72	2.55	0.63	3.64	0.69	3.20	0.77
Academic Discipline												
Math	3.22	0.65	3.76	0.72	3.68	0.70	2.44	0.72	3.53	0.69	2.98	0.86
Biology	3.18	0.70	3.94	0.65	3.70	0.65	2.47	0.60	3.44	0.69	3.04	0.83
Psychology	3.34	0.65	3.83	0.56	3.64	0.67	2.29	0.44	3.66	0.63	3.01	0.69
History	3.09	0.63	3.71	0.63	3.62	0.72	2.43	0.54	3.57	0.72	2.68	0.69

TABLE 3

F-Ratios for Sources of Variance in the 2×4 Analyses of Variance of the Six Scales of Behavior Instrumental to Recommendations for the Improvement of Undergraduate Education

Recommendation	*F*-ratio Overall	*F*-Ratio Institution Type (T)	*F*-Ratio Academic Disc. (D)	*F*-Ratio T × D
Faculty-student contact	2.06	7.73[a]	1.73	0.40
Program of advisement	8.54***	43.58***	2.38	4.94**
Performance feedback	1.71	6.51[a]	0.19	2.04
Learning about students	5.60***	27.47***	1.76	3.39*
Classroom climate	2.38*	6.26*	1.12	2.41
Improvement of teaching	8.34***	43.08***	3.40*	2.30

[a] Statistically nonsignificant, given nonsignificant Overall *F*-Ratio

*$p < 0.025$. **$p < 0.01$. ***$p < 0.001$

plines indicate that both biology (mean = 3.75), and psychology (mean = 3.68) are different from mathematics (mean = 3.20) in a statistically reliable way among faculty in RI universities. History (mean = 3.56), however, is not different in a statistically reliable way from mathematics or the other two disciplines. Thus, a norm supportive of a "systematic program of advisement" is present in biology, psychology, and history, but not in mathematics at RI universities.

For the recommendation urging an "egalitarian and tolerant classroom climate," Institutional Type was found to be statistically significant. The post-hoc mean comparison reveals that a norm supportive of this recommendation exists in CUCII institutions (mean = 3.64), but not in RI universities (mean = 3.44). However, this norm appears to be present in biology, mathematics, history, and psychology, given the statistically nonsignificant main effect for Academic Discipline. Because no statistically reliable main or interaction effects for "providing feedback on student performance" were discerned, we observe that a norm supportive of this recommendation is present in both types of institutions and the four academic disciplines represented in this study.

We also observed some form of statistical significance for two of the three recommendations for which norms are not in place: "learning about students" and "demonstration of a concern for college teaching." Although Institutional Type was found to be statistically significant for demonstration of a "concern for college teaching," the post-hoc mean comparisons do not suggest that a norm pertinent to this recommendation exists in either CUCII institutions (mean = 3.20) or RI universities (mean = 2.62). Likewise, the failure to find statistical significance for Academic Discipline indicates that a norm applicable to this recommendation is not present in biology, mathematics, history, or psychology.

Because a statistically significant interaction between Academic Discipline and Institutional Type was found for "learning about students," we first interpreted this interaction by following the same procedure we followed for "systematic program of advisement." Because neither of the ANOVAs we executed were statistically significant,[8] we conducted four ANOVAs — one for each of the four academic disciplines. For these analyses, Institutional Type was the factor. Only one of the four ANOVAs produced statistically significant results.[9] This finding indicates that mathematics faculty in CUCII institutions (mean = 2.80) ascribe a higher level of impropriety to this pattern of behaviors than do mathematics faculty in RI universities (mean = 2.06). Nevertheless, "learning about students" does not emerge as a recommendation fortified by a strong norm.

For the encouragement of "faculty-student contact" (a recommendation that approached the empirical definition of a norm — mean = 3.24), neither statistically significant main effects nor an interaction effect was identified. Consequently, neither institutional nor disciplinary differences in the existence of a norm pertinent to this particular recommendation exist.

Discussion

Following Durkheim's formulations concerning conformity, the possibility of successful implementation is strongest for those recommendations having supportive norms in place. Conversely, the possibility of successful implementation is uncertain for those recommendations not buttressed by a strong normative base. Without supportive norms in place, implementation of such recommendations are dependent on the inclinations of faculty. Some faculty choices will lead to successful implementation, whereas other choices made by faculty may prevent their fulfillment.

The likelihood of successfully implementing the recommendation urging "feedback on student performance" is high regardless of institutional type or academic discipline. The norms espoused by faculty in this study support the notion that feedback from assignments and examinations should be prompt, that the grading criteria should be clearly articulated, and that the written comments on test and papers are essential components of undergraduate instruction. Of the six recommendations, interestingly, this recommendation is the only one to have normative support by all faculty members regardless of discipline or institution affiliation.

On the other hand, the fostering of an "egalitarian classroom climate" and urging a "systematic program of advisement" are tempered

by either institutional type or academic discipline. For fostering an "egalitarian classroom climate," normative support is strong at CUCII institutions, but uncertain in RI universities. This finding may be linked to the different levels of emphasis traditionally placed on undergraduate education, graduate education, and research at these two types of institutions. In general, fostering an "egalitarian classroom climate" would be enhanced in a classroom environment where students had opportunities to react to comments made by the instructor as well as other students (e.g., discussion, collaborative learning). In a structured classroom environment controlled by the instructor (e.g., lecturing), an egalitarian classroom environment would be more difficult to support. Looking at CUCII institutions first, these institutions are essentially undergraduate institutions that place a high priority on undergraduate teaching [18]. Consequently, the focus on undergraduate education at these institutions may find faculty more aware of and receptive to student-centered and participatory teaching methods. Awareness of these methods coupled with the high regard for undergraduate education at CUCII institutions evidently supports a normative climate where egalitarian principles in the classroom are respected and encouraged.

Conversely, fostering an "egalitarian classroom climate" at RI universities appears to be more problematic. First, because of the priority frequently afforded to graduate education and research at the RI university, faculty members may not be acquainted with student-centered approaches that support an "egalitarian classroom climate." Additionally, these methods are frequently perceived by faculty to take more time and effort [4, 16], which, for many faculty translates into having less time for other priorities. Second, faculty at RI universities, because they are likely to be at the forefront of their disciplines, may be more committed to specific perspectives within their own field of study. Consequently, they may be more prone to a content-centered teaching approach that limits the level of undergraduate participation and egalitarian focus. From a practical perspective, acknowledging that there may not be strong normative support for fostering an" egalitarian classroom climate" appears to be an important consideration if implementing this recommendation at RI universities.

The probability of successfully implementing a "systematic program of advisement" is high in CUCII institutions regardless of academic discipline and high in RI universities for biology, history, and psychology. However, normative support for a "systematic program of advisement" is weak among faculty in mathematics (the hard-nonlife cell of Biglan's model) at RI universities. This finding may be related to two factors. First, the curriculum for undergraduate majors in disciplines in the hard-pure cell is often prescribed and sequential. Thus, faculty in the hard-

nonlife cell at RI universities may not feel as strongly about a systematic program of advisement as faculty in other disciplines because they perceive less of a need for advisement. Second, faculty members, particularly in mathematics, frequently approach their own scholarship independently rather than collaboratively or in research teams [22]. Faculty in mathematics at RI universities may expect their students to exercise the same independence when making decisions regarding academic endeavors. Nevertheless, why faculty members in the hard-nonlife cell at CUCII institutions supported a "systematic program of advisement" and faculty members at RI universities did not is less clear. Evidently, strong normative support for undergraduate education at CUCII institutions overrides any particular disciplinary effect.

In contrast, weak normative support for "faculty-student interaction," "learning about students," and a concern for the "improvement of teaching" may inhibit the successful implementation of these recommendations. Encouraging "faculty-student interaction," a recommendation not supported by a parallel normative structure in this study, may have resulted because this recommendation included faculty-student interaction that occurs "in addition" to regular in-class interaction and scheduled office hours. Platt, Parsons, and Kirshstein [33] reported that college and university faculty consider cognitive development to be the principal goal of undergraduate instruction. Thus, because faculty hold mastery of the discipline to be their most important instructional goal, faculty-student interaction on matters other than cognitive concerns (e.g., affective concerns, etc.) may be less likely to secure normative support. Furthermore, faculty-student interaction that enhances the affective as well as other domains may be more likely to occur during less formal interactions between a faculty member and student. As for "learning about students," apparently faculty members perceived this recommendation to be largely at their discretion and not requiring a strong supporting normative structure.

The lack of normative support for a concern for the "improvement of teaching" may be one of the more significant findings of this study. It posits that faculty did not consider it "inappropriate" if they avoid reading about college teaching, bypass professional development opportunities to enhance their own teaching, and/or refuse to incorporate new teaching methods or procedures into their own classrooms. Of course, "in order for improvement, it has to be acknowledged that something needs to be improved" [13]. Thus, the majority of the faculty in this study may think that they are good undergraduate teachers and that programs and literature designed to enhance their teaching are not necessary and/or are ineffective. Because this recommendation is closely linked to the overall theme of the national reports and the focus of this

inquiry (i.e., to improve undergraduate education), it deserves special attention. That is, if faculty norms do not support a concern for the "improvement of teaching" then this precedent may inhibit implementing the other recommendations as well.

Efforts to implement the recommendations of "faculty-student interaction," "learning about students," and concern for the "improvement of teaching" may prove to be particularly challenging regardless of academic discipline or institution affiliation, and special plans to implement these recommendations may be necessary. Otherwise, faculty will be relatively free to address these recommendations according to their own preferences. Some faculty actions will lead to successful realization, whereas other actions will prevent their attainment.

Conclusions

This study has centered on the norms espoused by faculty and whether these norms support or do not support efforts to improve undergraduate education. The findings indicate that normative support was not particularly strong for many of the teaching improvement recommendations that have been advocated by national consortiums and individual scholars. This finding, we believe, suggests that efforts to improve undergraduate teaching will require strategies that carefully consider the norms held by the faculty and the nature of the recommendation being implemented. Furthermore, this study suggests that faculty teaching norms, or what faculty consider to be appropriate or inappropriate behavior within a given undergraduate teaching context, sometimes differ according to the faculty member's discipline and institutional affiliation. Because of these differences, we believe that discipline and institutional affiliation will play a significant role in determining whether a faculty member embraces specific efforts to improve undergraduate education. These findings have important implications for individual colleges and universities as well as for higher education in general.

From a theoretical perspective, normative support for a given initiative, or lack thereof, significantly affects its likelihood of being successfully implemented. With a strong normative structure underlying a given teaching improvement recommendation, implementing and institutionalizing that recommendation will not require as much effort as when the underlying normative structure is weak. Within the context of a given institution, recommendations that are advocated and which have a strong normative structure will likely receive quick endorsement by the faculty. Conversely, when a recommendation is advocated to fac-

ulty that does not have a strong normative base, faculty deliberation will likely evolve. In these situations, the focus is apt to shift from the recommendation and its implementation to a discussion about what are appropriate or inappropriate undergraduate teaching practices.

For example, there was not strong normative support for the recommendation suggesting that faculty should learn about their students. Thus, efforts to implement this recommendation would likely meet resistance among faculty members. They would deliberate whether it was necessary that faculty learn the names and backgrounds of their students. Because of a weak normative structure, the focus would shift from how this recommendation could be implemented to whether learning about students is a behavior that should be supported. In summary, if there is not a substantial measure of agreement among faculty pertaining to what is considered appropriate and inappropriate teaching behavior, then a given recommendation is less likely to be implemented successfully.

These findings also suggest that strategies for implementing an undergraduate teaching improvement recommendation may vary depending on the faculty members involved. For instance, a program that encourages faculty members in the physical sciences to embrace a systematic program of advisement may be designed quite differently than a program that tries to implement the same recommendation with faculty in the social sciences. Where there is extremely weak normative support for teaching improvement initiatives, it may be necessary to change the norms among faculty before any recommendation could be institutionalized. To take advantage of the premises put forth in this study, however, individual colleges and universities may be best served if they understand the normative structure among their own faculty.

We encourage individual colleges and universities to use the approach advanced in this study to ascertain whether norms are present at their institutions. Such approaches might be expanded to ascertain the degree of consensus derived separately from faculty members, students, and academic administrators. With the findings of such institutional audits, individual colleges and universities could assess the probabilities of success in the implementation and achievement of proposed policies, procedures, or programs designed to improve undergraduate education. Such audits could also be used in the evaluation of such efforts. Where needed norms are extant, the probability of successful enactment of policies, procedures, and programs is likely. However, if the requisite norms are not in place, then successful enactment of a proposed effort to improve undergraduate education is relatively more problematic.

Other extensions may likewise be implemented, inasmuch as this

study is limited in several ways. First, the response context for the behaviors included in the "College Teaching Behaviors Inventory" is restricted to a classroom setting of moderate size intended for lower division undergraduate students. Second, this study is confined to faculty in four academic disciplines selected to be representative of the hard-soft and life-nonlife dimensions of Biglan's classification schema. A third limitation is that faculty from only two types of institutions — Comprehensive Universities and Colleges-II and Research I Universities — were included in this inquiry. It is possible that a different pattern of findings might have been obtained had different academic disciplines, different types of colleges and universities, and a different classroom context been used. Additionally, other recommendations might be found to have norms that support their implementation.

In this research, we have considered the role that norms play in facilitating or inhibiting teaching improvement measures. We have also shown that norms related to teaching improvement recommendations differ based on institutional type and disciplinary affiliation. For individual colleges and universities committed to a particular set of improvement measures, developing supportive norms for these improvement measures could significantly enhance their implementation strategy. Knowing how to change these norms at a college or university, nevertheless, is beyond the scope of this inquiry. Thus, we strongly encourage others to employ the perspectives, research leads, and research findings offered in this inquiry to extend the theoretical and practical applications of this work.

Notes

[1]Because only tenured faculty were included in the analyses conducted in the current study, assistant professors were eliminated from further analysis.

[2]Because of a clerical error, one individual was deleted from the sample of 800 individuals. Thus, the final sample was composed of 799 individuals.

[3]Specifically, the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory consisted of eight categories of teaching activity. These categories were not developed to represent expected normative configurations, but were used to organize the 126 teaching behaviors to make the instrument easier for individuals to complete. Because these categories are heuristic, it is possible to select specific behaviors from various categories within the instrument to determine whether they meet the criterion for designation as a norm. Moreover, the selection of specific behaviors does not adversely affect the reliability and validity of this Inventory as the eight categories were not developed to possess such psychometric qualities.

[4]We are indebted to Carla Howry of the American Sociological Association and to members of the ASA project on teaching for this assistance.

[5]Because of unequal cell sizes in each of the ANOVAs, we used the least-squares or regression approach.

[6]This relatively conservative level of statistical significance was chosen to reduce the probability of committing Type I errors. The probability of committing Type I er-

rors is a concern in this study for two reasons: (1) heterogeneous variances are present [6], and (2) cluster sampling was used [24].

[7]The ANOVA executed for CUCII institutions yielded an Overall F-Ratio of 2.27, $p < 0.083$, whereas the ANOVA for RI universities produced an F-Ratio for Academic Discipline of 5.08, $p < 0.002$.

[8]The Overall F-Ratio for CUCII institutions was 3.08, $p < 0.029$ and for RI universities it was 2.36, $p < 0.076$.

[9]These four ANOVAs produced the following Overall F-Ratios: History ($F = 2.82$, $p < 0.098$), psychology ($F = 3.41$, $p < 0.069$), biology ($F = 3.51$, $p < 0.066$), and mathematics ($F = 18.72$, $p < 0.0001$).

References

1. Association of American Colleges. *Integrity in the College Curriculum: A Report to the Academic Community.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges, 1985.
2. Baumgarten, E. "Ethics in the Academic Profession: A Socratic View." *Journal of Higher Education,* 53 (May/June 1982), 282–295.
3. Biglan, A. "Relationships between Subject Matter Area Characteristics and Output of University Departments." *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 57 (1973), 204–213.
4. Boehnert, J. B., and Moore, G. A. B. "From Research to Practice: Tying It All Together." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning,* 23 (1985), 83–93.
5. Bok, D. *Higher Learning.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986.
6. Boneau, C. A. "The Effects of Violations of Assumptions Underlying the *t* Test." *Psychological Bulletin,* 57 (1960), 49–64.
7. Boyer, E. L. *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America.* New York: Harper & Row, 1987.
8. Boyer, E. L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.* Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.
9. Braxton, J. M., Bayer, A. E., and Finkelstein, M. J. "Teaching Performance Norms in Academia." *Research in Higher Education,* 33 (October 1992), 533–569.
10. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. *A Classification of Institutions for Higher Education.* Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1987.
11. Chickering, A. W., and Gamson, Z. E. "Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education. *AAHE Bulletin,* 39 (1987), 3–7.
12. Creswell, J. W., and Roskens, R. W. "The Biglan Studies of Differences among Academic Areas." *Review of Higher Education,* 4 (1981), 1–16.
13. Cross, K. P. "Not Can, But Will College Teaching Be Improved?" *New Directions for Higher Education,* 17 (1977), 1–15.
14. Durkheim, E. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life.* London: Allen and Unwin (original work published in 1912), 1934.
15. Durkheim, E. *Suicide,* trans. John H. Saulding and George Simpson. New York: Free Press, 1951.
16. Easterby-Smith, M. "Change and Motivation in Higher Education: A Role for Corporate Strategy." *Higher Education,* 16 (1987), 37–52.

KP - 1459

17. Eble, K. E., and McKeachie, W. J. *Improving Undergraduate Education through Faculty Development.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.
18. Finnegan, D. E. "Segmentation in the Academic Labor Market: Hiring Cohorts in Comprehensive Universities. *Journal of Higher Education,* 64 (November/December 1993), 621–656.
19. Gaff, J. G. *New Life for the College Curriculum.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991.
20. Gibbs, J. P. *Norms, Deviance, and Social Control: Conceptual Matters.* New York: Elsevier, 1981.
21. Goode, W. J., and Hatt, P. K. *Methods of Social Research.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1952.
22. Hargens, L. L. *Patterns of Scientific Research.* Washington DC: American Sociology Association, Rose Monograph Series, 1975.
23. Katz, J. "Teaching Based on Knowledge of Students." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning,* 21 (1985), 3–11.
24. Kish, L. "Confidence Intervals for Clustered Samples." *American Sociological Review,* 22 (1957), 154–165.
25. Kitsuse, J. I. "Deviance, Deviant Behavior, and Deviants: Some Conceptual Issues." In *An Introduction to Deviance,* W. J. Filstead, 233–43, Chicago: Markham, 1972.
26. Leslie, L. L. "Are Response Rates Essential to Valid Surveys?" *Social Science Research,* 1 (1972), 323–334.
27. Mancini, B. J., and Tiberius, R. G. "Effective Social Arrangements for Teaching and Learning." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning,* 45 (1991), 87–109.
28. Mayhew, L. B., Ford, P. J., and Hubbard, D. L. *The Quest for Quality: The Challenge for Undergraduate Education in the 1990s.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.
29. McKeachie, W. J. *Teaching Tips: A Guide for the Beginning College Teacher.* Lexington, MA: Heath, 1986.
30. Merton, R. K. *Social Theory and Social Structure.* New York: The Free Press, 1968.
31. Merton, R. K. *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.
32. National Institute of Education. *Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Education, 1984.
33. Platt, G., Parsons, T., and Kirshstein, R. "Undergraduate Teaching Environments: Normative Orientations to Teaching among Faculty in the Higher Education System." *Sociological Inquiry,* 43 (1978), 3–21.
34. Reiss, A. "Delinquency as a Failure of Personal and Social Controls." *American Sociological Review,* 16 (1951), 196–207.
35. Robertson, E., and Grant, G. "Teaching and Ethics: An Epilogue." *Journal of Higher Education,* 53 (May/June 1982), 345–357.
36. Rossi, P. H., and Berk, R. A. "Varieties of Normative Consensus." *American Sociological Review,* 50 (June 1985), 333–347.

37. Schurr, G. M. "Toward a Code of Ethics for Academics." *Journal of Higher Education,* 53 (May/June 1982), 318–334.

38. Scriven, M. "Professional Ethics." *Journal of Higher Education,* 53 (May/June 1982), 307–317.

39. Weimer, M. *Improving College Teaching: Strategies of Developing Instructional Effectiveness.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

40. Wilson, E. K. "Power, Pretense, and Piggybacking: Some Ethical Issues in Teaching." *Journal of Higher Education,* 53 (May/June 1982), 268–281.

41. Zuckerman, H. E. "Deviant Behavior and Social Control in Science." In *Deviance and Social Change,* edited by E. Sagarin, pp. 87–138. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1977.

42. Zuckerman, H. E. "The Sociology of Science." In *Handbook of Sociology,* edited by Neal J. Smelser, pp. 511–574, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1988.

JE Gary Rhoades

Reorganizing the Faculty Workforce for Flexibility

Part-time Professional Labor

In the United States the rise of the academic profession in the last quarter of the nineteenth century was marked by the establishment of faculty as full-time employees of colleges and universities with career tracks in their fields [18, 32]. Subsequently the profession struggled to establish autonomy vis-a-vis managers and boards, as the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) successfully inscribed tenure and academic freedom in institutional policy and in case law [36].[1] In the post-World War II era, many faculty gained such autonomy from the organization that analysts contrasted "local" and "cosmopolitan" faculty [7] and spoke of an "academic revolution" [12] in which faculty's power within and beyond the university increased by virtue of their research and grants activity.

However, the last quarter of the twentieth century has seen challenges to faculty autonomy and job security. The AAUP censure list [33, 35] and case law reveal ongoing violations of academic freedom and tenure. Amidst criticism of faculty as self-interested careerists, demands for more accountability and the reform or elimination of tenure emerged in the 1970s and 1990s. Many faculty have been retrenched [29]. Moreover, there is a twenty-five-year trend of increased numbers and percentage of part-time relative to full-time faculty [1, 21]. Managers in higher education have hired more part-time workers to minimize costs and maximize managerial control in providing educational services. The professional position of faculty is being renegotiated, with an increased emphasis on managerial flexibility in relation to the academic workforce.

Gary Rhoades is associate professor of higher education in the University of Arizona's Center for the Study of Higher Education.

Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 67, No. 6 (November/December 1996)
Copyright 1996 by the Ohio State University Press

In this article I address several professional workforce issues as they relate to part-time faculty, concentrating on unionized institutions. I look at unionized institutions because most part-time faculty are found in the type of institution most likely to be unionized — community colleges, comprehensive state colleges, and universities. Also, the professional status of such part-timers and the political battle surrounding their use are clear in the formalized context of collective bargaining. I focus on part-timers because their growing numbers represent a challenge to the academic profession's definition of faculty lines as full-time, with a secure future. The use of part-time faculty also represents an explicit challenge to tenure as the professional structure that defines faculty's terms of employment.

Most of the higher education literature on part-timers is taxonomic and/or functionalist [6, 39]. It offers insights into the previously unmapped terrain of part-time faculty by classifying types of part-timers. In addition to providing an overview of employment conditions and use of part-timers, this literature focuses on issues such as motivation (of employers and part-timers) and quality [6, 16]. It recommends planned, rational use of part-time faculty, incorporating them into the organization, improving their practice, and enhancing educational/institutional performance [5]. In short, the literature promotes "effective policies and practices" [20]. Generally sympathetic to part-time faculty [3, 6] the literature accepts managers' stated need for increasing numbers of such faculty. Many problems experienced by part-timers are attributed to full-time faculty more interested in protecting their professional privileges than in educational quality or employment equity [15]. That critique has been extended to the tenure system, portrayed as inhibiting necessary managerial flexibility and causing the exploitation of part-timers:

> Are [full-time faculty] willing to preserve tenure and the associated privileges at the expense of exploited nontenure-track academic workers? . . . We question . . . the viability of the existing tenure system because it requires that tenured faculty be subsidized with a work force that carries heavy loads at low pay [6, pp. 229–30].

By contrast, working out of professionalization theory, my analytical interest is in how the faculty is being reorganized as a managed, professional workforce. I do not study the use and condition of part-timers to make policies and practices more "rational" (and organizations more "effective"). Rather, I seek to understand the politics of professional work that surround the managerial press for greater flexibility in dealing with academic personnel. I systematically analyze the political negotiation between management and professional labor (faculty). These

parties' strategies and positions are embedded in collectively bargained contracts, in clauses that either enhance managerial discretion in or ensure professional constraints on the utilization of part-time faculty.[2] I am also interested in schism and stratification within the profession. The divide between full- and part-time faculty highlighted in the literature is a key fault line. I focus on part-timers' conditions of employment to provide insight into the gradations of faculty — between full- and part-timers, and among types of part-timers.

Recent sociological research offers various views of professionals' position in society. Most such work addresses challenges to professional autonomy, grounded in social movements, divisions among professions, or the privatization and transformation of professionalism [2, 4, 25, 38]. Professions are conceptualized as monopolies of expertise with control over a domain of work — they establish jurisdiction and closure in a task and organizational arena. Challenge to a profession, then, is conceptualized as other groups (lay groups, other professions) working to weaken a particular profession's control over entry into and practice of an area of work.

I extend and modify the higher education literature by applying this professionalization analytic in studying the use of part-time faculty. I extend and modify the sociological literature in two ways. First, the professionalization literature is heavily weighted toward studies of the most elite professions — e.g., medicine, law. It tends to overlook faculty. It completely ignores unionized faculty, sustaining the conventional contrast between unionized and professional occupations.[3] I think that the large numbers of faculty covered by collective bargaining agreements (anywhere from 25% to 33% of the profession, depending on whose figures you adopt) merit consideration. I also think that the treatment of part-time faculty in unionized institutions provides insight into the management of faculty in general.[4] Second, the professionalization literature concentrates on the negotiation *between* professions and broader society, or *among* professions; less attention has been directed to social relations *within* organizations and *within* professions, between managers and professionals, or between different segments of a profession [9, 10, 41]. I concentrate on formal negotiations between faculty and organizational managers [30].[5] I also focus on intra-professional stratification of full- and part-time faculty.

Methods

My research addresses two questions: (a) To what extent do collectively bargained faculty contracts provide for managerial discretion or

professional constraint regarding the use of part-time faculty?; and (b) To what extent are part-time faculty's conditions of employment different from those of full-time faculty? The first question speaks to formal negotiation between management and professional labor over personnel and workforce actions. The second question speaks to the gradations of faculty in their conditions of work.

I examined the contracts of 183 institutions and systems in the 1990s that address part-time faculty (some contracts are for state systems or for districts — e.g., California State University System, Minnesota Community Colleges, Los Angeles Community College District — and cover many different institutions). (I did not include an additional 5 contracts that cover only part-time faculty in my analysis.) My sample is drawn from a data base of 211 faculty contracts in the 1990s, covering approximately 45% of all faculty agreements. Thus, 87% of the contracts in the data base explicitly speak to some term of professional labor for part-time faculty.

The data base has been collected by the National Education Association (NEA) and put on CD ROM in a package — the Higher Education Contract Analysis System (HECAS) — that enables searching contracts for key words and phrases. It includes contracts negotiated by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), and independent agents, as well as by the NEA, but is weighted toward the NEA. Nationally, the NEA is the bargaining agent for 46%, the AFT for 31%, and the AAUP for 11% of all collective bargaining agreements. In my sample of 183 contracts, NEA is the agent for 119 (65%), AFT for 39 (21%), and the AAUP for 9 (5%) contracts (the rest are independent agents). Most of the contracts (124 — 68%) are for community colleges, 45 (24%) are for four-year institutions, and 14 (8%) are for technical institutions, virtually identical to the distribution in the HECAS population, and comparable to the national distribution: 70% in two-year, 30% in four-year institutions. The overrepresentation of the NEA in my sample makes sense: part-time faculty are most prominent in two-year institutions, where the NEA is strongest [29]. Moreover, research suggests that the NEA is the faculty union most receptive to part-timers [15].[6]

In addressing my first research question I examined references to part-time faculty that related to personnel and special workforce actions — i.e., appointment and release, retrenchment—or to the workforce's makeup — e.g., the number or proportion of full- and part-time faculty. References to general hiring and firing were coded as Appointment/Release. References were coded as Individual Workforce when they applied to conditions surrounding layoff, with language re-

ferring to the rights of individual workers in the action. Such rights do not necessarily impact the total number of part-timers, or their ratio to full-timers. References were coded as Collective Workforce when the language explicitly invoked the total or proportional numbers of part-time faculty *or* when language implicitly referred to workforce makeup by addressing contingencies surrounding the hiring of additional part-time faculty. Lastly, I coded language that (dis)allowed conversion of full- to part-time positions, or that provided for conversion of part- to full-time lines as Conversion.

For each coding, I looked for evidence of managerial discretion and professional constraint. Evidence of managerial discretion took three forms: (a) absence of conditions surrounding workforce actions — e.g., if conditions of layoff are not specified, greater discretion lies in managers' hands;[7] (b) explicit statements of management rights regarding workforce matters — e.g., "deem clauses" [29]; and/or (c) exceptions to particular rules — e.g., order of layoff — with managers having discretion to determine whether exceptions applied. Evidence of professional constraint consisted of (a) explicit and/or absolute conditions inhibiting managerial discretion—e.g., "thou shalt not" phrases, or (b) language providing faculty and/or the union discretion in determining the application of conditions or exceptions.

In addressing my second research question I examined part-time faculty's conditions of work and looked for explicit ranking of professional privileges by full and part-time status. In identifying such conditions, I was guided by contracts' structure. I examined part-timers' Rights and Perquisites to gauge the extent to which they are extended the privileges enjoyed by full-timers and whether part-time faculty have opportunities for professional development. I investigated part-timers' Duties, to find if they are responsible for having office hours, being evaluated, and participating in the academic life of their units. I coded the extent to which Experience as a part-time teacher was even credited by the institution in a range of contractual considerations (e.g., seniority, time toward some professional right or perquisite). Finally, I coded any contractual conditions in which full-time faculty were explicitly given priority over part-time faculty (or vice-versa) as Priority.

In each of the coding categories identified above, the unit of analysis is a phrase or substantive mention rather than a straight count of every time the term "part-time" appeared. For example, if "part-time" appeared several times in a sentence/paragraph dealing with only one substantive dimension of appointment, it was coded as one reference. Of the 2,999 references in the contracts to part-time faculty, the largest number were passing references (e.g., headings, indexes, recognition as

part of the bargaining unit), or were to definitions, or to pay. Most of the latter referred to the part-time *rate* as it applied to full-time faculty working overload, in summer, and the like. I coded all references to part-timers but do not present the data on the latter categories because they are not very relevant to my research questions.

The content analysis described above is state-of-the-art for contract analysis [13, 15, 29, 40]. I extend common practice substantively by virtue of the large number of contracts in my sample. My sample size enables me also to extend common practice analytically. I supplement my textual content analysis with a chi-square analysis of two contexts — type of institution and unit membership, comparing the incidence of contractual terms and conditions of academic labor in the relevant populations (two-year, four-year, and technical institutions; full-time only units, and those including part-timers). Past studies of higher education institutions and of contractual conditions [29] suggest the likelihood of significant variation between two-and four-year institutions. The different legal boundaries of contracts covering only full-time faculty versus those covering some or all part-time faculty, and the different interests of these constituencies, suggest the likelihood of significant variations between contracts with different unit membership.

In regard to unit membership, roughly one-third (36%) of the 183 contracts I analyzed cover only full-time faculty. That means some 118 contracts *do cover* some or all part-timers.[8] Different definitions of unit membership carry varying legal limitations in what the agent can bargain. For example, a unit that represents only full-time faculty cannot bargain salaries for part-time faculty. Moreover, a unit that represents some part-time faculty often defines part-time in such a way as to exclude large numbers of part-time faculty. Such a unit cannot bargain some matters for excluded part-timers. The scope of membership affects the scope of what can be bargained. Nevertheless, *any* unit may negotiate conditions that directly and indirectly affect part-time faculty. For example, contracts that cover only full-timers may speak to personnel and workforce matters, the focus of my first research question. They may ensure the involvement of full-timers in the hiring of part-time faculty, institute an order of layoff that gives priority to full- over part-time faculty, and establish staffing ratios to limit the proportion of part-time faculty. In fact, there is not one condition of work that I study that is not addressed in some contracts covering only full-timers. Of course, one would expect that contracts covering only full-timers would be far less likely to speak to professional privileges for part-time faculty, the focus of my second research question. Thus, I attend to unit membership in analyzing the provision of such privileges. In setting up

this discussion I also discuss the gradations of part-time status embedded in the definition of unit membership in the 123 contracts that cover some or all part-timers.

Managerial Flexibility and Professional Constraint: Part-Time Faculty in Workforce Actions

Appointment/release. Managerial flexibility is greatest when no conditions surrounding part-time faculty are specified. The absence of conditions is striking in general personnel actions. Conditions of Appointment/Release of part-time faculty are *not* specified in 140 of the 183 contracts in which part-timers are mentioned. All but 3 of the 43 contracts with such conditions deal with appointment. Most constitute brief references to postings or listings of jobs and to the logistics of the appointment process. Only 9 contracts provide for full-time faculty's involvement in hiring part-timers. Faculty's limited, advisory role is evident in Western Michigan University's contract, which provides faculty "the right to make timely recommendations to the appropriate administrator," but follows that line with a deem clause:

> Nothing in this article, however, shall prevent Western from hiring part-time instructors at its sole discretion when the need to hire a part-time faculty member is unexpected and there is insufficient time to consult with departmental faculty (Article 14.1).

The clause ensures managerial flexibility. In short, managerial flexibility in (re)hiring part-time faculty is seldom subject to professional constraint.

The discretion enjoyed by managers is even greater in releasing part-time faculty. Release is dealt with in only 6 contracts. One of these contracts (the State University of New York) points to gradations of part-time faculty, by continuity of service.

> Written notice that a term appointment is not to be renewed upon expiration is to be given to the employee by the College President, or designee, not less than: a. 45 calendar days prior to the end of a part-time service appointment; b. Three months prior to the end of a term expiring at the end of an appointee's first year of uninterrupted service within the University. . . . c. Six months prior to the end of a term expiring after the completion of one, but not more than two years of an appointee's uninterrupted service within the University . . . d. Twelve months prior to the expiration of a term after two or more years of uninterrupted service within the University (Article 32).

Two contracts provide due process constraints on the release of part-time faculty. Shasta-Tehama-Trinity College's contract has a clause on

the part-time faculty member's right to appeal, although the appeal is "through the administrative chain to the Vice President for Instruction, whose decision shall be final" (Article 1.6.1.1.a). The grievance procedure (which includes arbitration) in Schoolcraft College's contract applies to part-time faculty. However, these exceptions prove the rule of limited professional protections and constraints for part-time faculty in the contracts. Few part-timers enjoy contractual protections that are common for full-time faculty. In sum, full-time faculty have very little control over the hiring of part-time faculty. Few part-timers have contractual protections in hiring and firing processes. Managerial discretion in this arena is not subject to professional constraint in the contracts.

There are variations in the existence of Appointment/Release conditions by institutional type and unit membership. No contracts in technical colleges have clauses, and four-year institutions are slightly overrepresented. A chi-square analysis reveals a dependent association ($\chi^2 = 4.8$), significant at the 0.05 level. However, that result applies to the absence of technical college contracts (a chi-square analysis in which two-year and technical colleges are collapsed obtains a χ^2 of 1.9, which is not significant). As for unit membership, contracts for full-time faculty only are underrepresented (21%, versus 36% of the sample) in defining conditions of Appointment/Release. A chi-square analysis reveals a dependent association of such clauses and unit membership ($\chi^2 = 5.26$, significant at the 0.025 level). That finding is curious: one might expect full-time-only contracts to ensure full-timers' involvement in hiring part-time faculty (yet, only 2 of the 9 contracts with such clauses are in full-time-only units).

Individual workforce. Just less than half (87) of contracts mentioning part-timers do so in regard to workforce actions affecting individuals — e.g., layoff. In 52% of my sample managerial discretion is not contractually constrained by provisions for full- relative to part-time faculty's job rights in retrenchment.[9] Nor is managerial discretion constrained by contractually defined rights of part-time faculty.

Four types of individual workforce conditions are identified. By far the most common (63 references in 59 contracts) is order of layoff — providing that *within the layoff unit*, part-time faculty will be laid off prior to full-time faculty. However, such provisions virtually always include the condition that administrators can violate that order of layoff if they determine that the remaining full-time faculty cannot fulfill the program's academic needs. Although "academic needs" are an academic judgment, none of the clauses call for a faculty body to make or be consulted about such a decision: discretion is entirely in administrators'

hands. That discretion is contractually unconstrained in the 152 (72%) contracts in the HECAS database that lack any reference to layoff order of full- and part-timers in retrenchment actions. Compared to Leslie and Ikenberry's [15] finding in 1979 that 40% of contracts specified that part-timers will be laid off first or will not be retained in exigent circumstances, managerial discretion has increased.

Overwhelmingly, references to part-time faculty in individual workforce actions do *not* have to do with part-time faculty's rights: instead, they establish the priority of full- relative to part-time faculty. Determining layoff order by job status obviously strengthens powerful status differences that are also evident in reassignment or displacement rights given to full-time faculty who are to be laid off. If a full-time faculty member can fill out or construct a full-time load out of current part-time duties they will be reassigned rather than laid off. Of 15 such references in 14 contracts, 5 provide that full-timers can be reassigned to part-time jobs, effectively giving managers the discretion to convert full- to part-time positions. If a full-time faculty member is qualified to teach classes taught by current part-time faculty, he or she will displace the part-timers rather than be laid off (23 references in 19 contracts). Managers make the academic decision of whether the full-time faculty member is qualified to teach the part-time(rs') courses.

The fourth type of individual workforce category is recall, providing laid-off faculty the right within a defined time period (generally between 1–5 years) to claim new jobs for which they are qualified in the layoff unit. The references to part-time in this context give laid-off full-timers the right to new part-time positions in the layoff unit (also the right to turn them down), generally without sacrificing their claim within the given time period to a new full-time position. Of 23 references in 22 contracts, 4 provide recall rights *of* part-timers to such positions, the *only* examples in the Individual Workforce references of part-time faculty being given professional rights. In the absence of such contractual constraints, managerial discretion in dealing with part-timers in special individual workforce actions is extensive.

In short, some professional claims of full-time relative to part-time faculty are defined in displacement, reassignment, and recall clauses. Yet, managers enjoy considerable discretion even in clauses that seek to protect the jobs of full- relative to part-time faculty — i.e., order of layoff provisions (see also [29]). Finally, the rights of part-timers of any sort are overlooked even in those contracts that cover at least some part-timers. Only 4 of 56 contracts with Individual workforce provisions that cover at least some part-time faculty define rights for any group of

part-timers. Managerial discretion, then, in regard to part-time faculty professional rights is virtually unconstrained in the contracts.

Individual workforce clauses are slightly underrepresented in the contracts of two-year institutions. However, a chi-square analysis reveals that institutional type is independent of incidence of Individual workforce clauses ($\chi^2 = 3.98$; collapsing technical and two colleges yields a chi-square of 3.71, significant at the 0.1, but not the 0.05 level). The incidence of such clauses by unit membership mirrors the distribution of sample contracts.

Disaggregating such clauses, the incidence of different types of Individual workforce provisions *are* dependent on institutional type and/or unit membership. Order of layoff provisions are dependent on institutional type ($\chi^2 = 14.6$, significant at the 0.005 level). Contracts in two-year colleges are underrepresented in defining Order of layoff, whereas those in four-year institutions are overrepresented. That finding is consistent with earlier research on the differential nature of retrenchment clauses in two- and four-year institutions [29]. Yet, institutional type is independent of Recall, Displacement, and Reassignment provisions ($\chi^2 = 1{,}23$, 5.42, 0.5 respectively). Dependent associations by unit membership are found for Recall ($\chi^2 = 10.46$, significant at the 0.005 level) and Reassignment ($\chi^2 = 4.35$, significant at the 0.05 level) clauses, but not for Displacement provisions ($\chi^2 = 2.81$, significant at the 0.1, but not the 0.05 level). In the first case contracts covering only full-time faculty are underrepresented: 21 of 22 provisions are in contracts that cover full- and part-timers. That runs counter to an expectation that full-time-only contracts are more likely to assert the priority of full- over part-time faculty. However, that expectation is realized in Reassignment clauses: 9 of the 15 clauses are in full-time-only contracts.

Collective workforce. Collective workforce provisions constitute the clearest constraints on managerial discretion in hiring part-time faculty. Individual workforce provisions offer some protection for current full-time *faculty*, but do not protect full-time *lines* either currently or in the future. Managers may increase the number of part-time faculty by filling vacated full-time lines with part-timers or by hiring more part-time faculty. Of the 211 contracts in HECAS, 20% have collective workforce provisions limiting the number or ratio of part-time faculty. Of the 183 contracts that refer to part-time faculty, 29% have such provisions.

The negotiating positions of faculty unions and of administration are evidenced in two contracts discussed below. Each contains provisions limiting the use of part-time faculty as well as clauses providing for

administrative discretion in the use of part-timers. The first case applies generally to the proportion of part-timers' collective instructional load:

> The total number of contact hours generated by part-time faculty members during the Fall and Winter semesters shall not exceed 37% of the total number of credit hours generated within the college during the Fall, Winter, and Spring/Summer semesters. Non-credit contact hours shall not be subject to this provision. [Section 0107.5] The College shall have the unrestricted right to use part-time and/or full-time adjunct faculty notwithstanding the provisions of 0107.5 of the Agreement [Section 0108.1] (Washtenaw Community College).

The Association position is to cap part-time faculty use by limiting the ratio of total credit hours that part-timers generate; the administration position is to have unrestricted rights to use part-timers. The last line of Section 0107.5 is an important exclusion to the credit hour cap, restricting the scope of full-time faculty's curricular control to *credit* courses. The second contract captures the struggle surrounding part-timers' use in case of retrenchment.

> A faculty member on recall shall have the first right of refusal to any part-time assignments in her/his reduction-in-force unit(s); provided, failure to accept such assignment shall not alter recall rights to full-time vacancies otherwise established; and further provided nothing herein shall require the District to consolidate part-time positions into a full-time position. In the instances where a full-time faculty member is on recall status, the number of part-time assignments, if any, made in the applicable reduction-in-force unit shall not be increased over the number in existence at the time of reduction-in-force by more than the equivalent of one-half of a full-time load (Article F.9, Columbia Basin College).

The Association position is to fight the conversion of full- to part-time lines in retrenchment; the administration position is to have a free hand, with no requirement to save full-time lines by consolidating part-time jobs.

Of course, the replacement of full-time lines with part-time faculty can take place not only through retrenchment but also through attrition. Western Michigan University's contract addresses this as a matter for study, with the Chapter and the University meeting to discuss: the distribution and number of tenure-track positions by department over time; the credit hour generation of different categories of faculty by department; and the number of vacated lines that have been filled by tenure-track or non-unit, renewable term instructors. What is at issue is whether full-time faculty will retain their overall share of positions and curricular responsibility (in credit hour generation).

Of the 53 contracts with collective workforce provisions, 11 have clauses that in various ways ensure managerial discretion in determining the total numbers and proportions of full- and part-time faculty. For example:

> Full-time faculty members shall be given employment preference over part-time faculty members; however, the College reserves the right to determine the number of full- and part-time faculty (Section 2.1.G, Baker College).
>
> The district reserves the right to establish the number of full-time and part-time faculty to be employed (Article IX.8.b, Skagit Valley College).

Each of the above clauses establishes that it is solely the responsibility of the administration to determine the configuration of the faculty workforce. Indeed, responsibility regarding "the number of full- and part-time faculty required to operate the educational program" is defined in Baker College's contract as a Management Right (Section 1.5). A clause in Kirtland Community College's contract extends that "exclusive right" to reorganization actions.

> The board has the exclusive right to initiate, eliminate, or modify college programs to meet the changing needs of the college and its constituents. It is recognized by both parties that all college programs are under continuing critical review and there is a possibility that current staffing needs and staffing configuration could change. Enrollment factors may also cause adjustment to part-time status (Article XVI.M).

In the 42 contracts (and 62 references) that limit managerial discretion in collective workforce issues there is much variation in the provisions. The most common clauses speak to retrenchment (18 references), the ratio of part- to full-time faculty (15 references), or to restricting the use of part-time faculty to replace full-timers (12 references). Relatedly, 8 references deal with the legitimate uses of part-time faculty.

Collective workforce clauses regarding retrenchment generally focus on order of layoff in a collective sense or on hiring part-timers during layoff.

> The University in its discretion may renew and retain Lecturers provided that it is agreed that in case of retrenchment or imminent retrenchment in the faculty bargaining unit, Lecturers and Adjuncts are and remain part-time faculty; and it is understood and agreed that in accordance with the Order of Retrenchment, and without exception regardless of other rights or entitlements claimed, NO FULL-TIME UNITS FACULTY, TENURED OR UNTENURED, MAY BE RETRENCHED AHEAD OF PART-TIME (LESS THAN FULL-TIME) FACULTY, said order being "absolute in any retrenchment situation, anything in the contrary notwithstanding" (Caps in original, Article X.B.5, University of Lowell).

Such collective order definitions are an exception to the contractual rule. McHenry Community College's administrative deem clause makes explicit what holds true overwhelmingly for contracts with order clauses.

> The order of layoff set forth in paragraphs 3-5 above shall not require the Board to dismiss all part-time, probationary, or less senior faculty members prior to any layoff of a full-time tenured faculty member (Article IX.6).

Priority of full-time faculty in layoff order is not absolute. Managers are free to retain part-time faculty even as they lay off full-timers.

Several contracts speak to hiring part-timers during layoff: the restriction may apply to the layoff unit or to the institution as a whole.

> In the instances where a full-time faculty member is on recall status, the number of part-time assignments, if any, made in the applicable reduction-in-force unit shall not be increased over the number in existence at the time of reduction-in-force by more than the equivalent of one-half of a full-time load (Article F.9, Columbia Basin College).
>
> If there is to be a reduction in force at the College involving layoff of full-time members, . . . the College will, in consultation with the RCCEA and FAMAT, maintain the subsequent annual general fund budget for part-time faculty positions at a level no higher than the increase needed to provide for any negotiated part-time salary increase (Article 9.B.2, Rogue Community College).

Some workforce clauses limit the conversion of full to part-time lines more generally. However, contractual language often affords managers much discretion.

> The Board shall not seek the employment of part-time teachers for the purpose of reducing the number of professorial staff, replacing full-time teachers (Appendix G, Macomb Community College).
>
> The College will attempt to employ qualified full-time faculty for full-time positions in preference to part-time personnel, where, qualified, provided, however, that full-time faculty are reasonably available and interested in such employment (Article X, Clinton Community College).
>
> The College will attempt to employ qualified full-time staff members for full-time positions in preference to part-time personnel where qualified full-time staff members are reasonably available and interested in such employment, and such full-time employment is consistent with the long range educational objectives of the College (Article V.A, Schenectady County Community College).

Phrases such as "for the purpose of," "will attempt," "where qualified," or "reasonably available," give managers considerable flexibility. By contrast, some contracts' language prohibits the replacement of full- with part-timers.

> The Board shall not use part-time employees to replace full-time members presently employed (Section 0107.3, Washtenaw Community College).
>
> Adjunct faculty will not be used in combination with one or more part-time employees as a replacement for a full-time faculty member who vacates a bargaining unit position (Article I.1.b, Lakeland Faculty Association).

The strongest restrictions on managerial discretion lie in clauses that call for reduced numbers of part-time faculty or that lock the institution into particular ratios (or delimit parameters) of full- to part-time faculty, in this way shaping the academic workforce. Various levels of specificity are built into these provisions — overall numbers or workload (e.g., credit hours), departmental ratios, procedures for when the prescribed ratio is exceeded.

> The University, in consultation with the Association, shall develop a plan to reduce dependence on part-time faculty (Article II.B.1, Shawnee State University).
>
> [T]he current practice generally shall prevail with full-time instructors assigned to teach approximately two-thirds of all on-campus classes. Exclusions to the ratio shall continue for community education classes, EMD classes, apprenticeship classes, sabbatical replacement classes, and fee generated classes. . . . [T]he College President and the Association President will meet at least once annually to compare base salary budgets of full-time to part-time faculty (excluding fringes and fees) to make certain the current 4.4 to 1 ratio has not changed significantly. If the budgeted dollar ratio moves to a position of 4.1 to 1 or under, the College agrees to correct the ratio to not less than 4.4 to 1 for the following budget year (Article 3.2, Clackamas Community College).
>
> The College will maintain 162 full-time district funded faculty positions on an institutional basis as long as the annual student full-time equivalency remains between 5,000 and 7,000. If the student full-time equivalency drops below 5,000 or rises above 7,000 the college will maintain a fiscal year instruction ratio of sixty percent full-time to forty percent part-time (Appendix G, Mt. Hood Community College).
>
> The part-time faculty to full-time faculty ratio based on credit hours taught will not exceed a 1:4 ratio on an annual basis. . . . Whenever the part-time to full-time ratio in a department exceeds 1:3, the department, the dean, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs will meet to address the excessive reliance upon part-time faculty and to design a plan to rectify this excessive reliance (Article D.13, Saginaw Valley State University).
>
> Except at the Massachusetts College of Art, not more than fifteen percent of an academic department's total number of three credit courses and sections shall be taught by part-time employees during an academic year (Article XX.C.9, Massachusetts State College System).
>
> There may be no more than 1 nine hour part-time assignment in any department. In the case of new programs, there may be 2 nine credit hour part-

> time assignments. This could not continue beyond the fourth semester of the program's operation (Section 1.1.4.b & c, Joliet Junior College).

What is evident in all of the provisions above is that faculty union strategies involve seeking to control not the hiring/firing and quality but the numbers and use of part-timers. One exception to this rule — Ferris State University's contract — illustrates that the strategies could go hand in hand.

> Commencing winter quarter 1988, no course shall be taught by a non-bargaining unit member for more than one quarter unless the credentials of the non-bargaining unit member have been made available for review to the bargaining unit members in the seniority unit in which the class is offered. Unless two-thirds of the bargaining unit members reviewing the aforementioned credentials recommend against hiring the non-bargaining unit member for the specified class(es), the non-bargaining unit member may be hired for that class(es). The recommendation, however, must come from more than one reviewing bargaining unit member (Article 17).

However, the overwhelming empirical reality is that they do not. Instead, bargaining agents aim to restrict the use of part-time faculty to certain delimited realms and ratios identified in recommendations issued by national faculty unions. Eight contracts explicate such legitimate uses. For example:

> Temporary faculty may be employed each year in all ranks. These temporary appointments may be caused by such conditions as the following: the absence of faculty, sickness, study or sabbatical leave, or emergency personal situations. The period of service for such an appointee shall not exceed one year in length. . . . Part-time appointments by the College shall not be used to circumvent the intent of this Agreement by eliminating the hiring of full-time personnel. When a department has in two consecutive years the full-time equivalent of one and one-half positions, exclusive of replacements created by leaves or emergencies, the Board shall make every effort to fund an additional full-time position for that department (Section 7.12, Rhode Island College).

What is also evident in the provisions regarding ratios is that broad areas of the curriculum — particularly for community colleges — are exempted from professional constraints, leaving much room for managerial discretion. The ratio restrictions in Saginaw Valley State's contract do not apply to off-campus programs in two areas or to non-credit continuing education programs. Ratio limits in Roger Williams University and Shasta-Tehama-Trinity College contracts apply only to day courses. The Lincoln University contract's ratio limit does not apply to graduate programs or to summer sessions. (Along the same lines, Ferris State University's contract provides for the creation of full-

time positions from continuing part-time loads, but excepts part-time clinical faculty and cooperative education.) Such exclusions are particularly significant in that the excepted areas of the curriculum are growth areas.

Although a number of collective workforce provisions protect the work and positions of full-time faculty, only one protects the rights of part-timers. The University of Massachusetts at Amherst's contract provides for the increased job security of various grades of part-time faculty, ensuring longer contracts for larger numbers of part-time faculty.

> A minimum of 40 percent of bargaining unit faculty shall be offered one-year contracts (current — 35 percent) and 15 percent shall be offered two-year contracts (Article XXI).

In short, 53 contracts have collective workforce provisions. In 21% of those contracts, managers are accorded authority to determine the configuration of the workforce. In the remaining contracts, 23% of my total sample, various professional constraints are established on the use and the numbers/proportion of part-time faculty. Nevertheless, in most cases provisions still afford managers much discretion. Only 1 contract (of the 118 that cover at least some part-timers) limits managerial discretion through the establishment of professional rights of part-time faculty.

In 1979 Leslie and Ikenberry [15] found that 38% of the 50 contracts they studied had clauses limiting the hiring of part-timers, a considerably higher incidence than I found. The divergent findings might be a result in part of the fact that they included clauses that do not constitute collective workforce provisions as I have defined them. For example, they included provisions that restrict part-time faculty members to no more than 60% of a full-time load; I coded that as the definition of a part-timer.

The divergent findings might also be due to differences in the samples. In particular, contracts covering only full-time faculty are only 36% of my sample, as opposed to about 60% of Leslie and Ikenberry's sample. One might expect that such contracts would be more likely to have collective workforce limitations on the numbers and proportions of part-time faculty than would contracts that cover at least some part-time faculty. Yet, chi-square analysis indicates that the incidence of collective workforce provisions in general is not dependent on unit membership ($\chi^2 = 1.14$). Nor are the categories of collective workforce provisions — Ratio, Order, and Replacement (χ^2s = 0.03, 0.34, and 2.84, respectively). In other words, the 65 contracts covering only full-time faculty are statistically no more likely to

have such provisions than the 118 contracts that cover at least some part-timers.

One collective workforce provision is dependent on institutional type. The incidence of collective workforce provisions in general is not dependent on institutional type ($\chi^2 = 1.14$). However, separating out those contracts with provisions according administrators discretion in collective workforce matters, the 42 remaining contracts that offer some professional constraints on managerial discretion *are* significantly associated with institutional type ($\chi^2 = 9.66$, significant at the 0.01 level). Contracts in four-year institutions are overrepresented (contracts in two-year colleges are underrepresented) among contracts with collective workforce provisions limiting managerial discretion: they account for 40.5% of contracts with such clauses, although they represent only 24% of the contracts in my sample. However, the three categories of provisions — Ratio, Order, and Replacement — are *not* dependent on institutional type (χ^2s = 4.29, 4.22, and 2.01, respectively).[10]

Conversion. Perhaps the most dramatic example of managers' discretion to shape the faculty workforce profile is those clauses which explicitly grant managers the right to convert full- to part-time positions. Ten contracts have such clauses (by contrast, 4 clauses in the collective workforce category call for "reverse conversion" — the translation of part-time assignments into new full-time positions). Some apply to retrenchment: full-time faculty can accept a part-time position in lieu of layoff. The blanket deem clause of Lehigh County Community College dramatizes managers' degrees of freedom.

> The College's decision to retrench and the resulting layoff of faculty or reduction to part-time status shall not be subject to the grievance/arbitration procedure by either the Association or the faculty member(s) so effected (Appendix A).

Some conversion clauses are general provisions enabling managers to reduce full- to part-time positions. A few others refer to voluntary adjustments or to reduced workload programs (these do not include voluntary retirement clauses, found in 33 contracts).

Overall then, managerial discretion is extensive. Of the 188 contracts that address part-time faculty, 117 speak to workforce issues in either individual and/or collective terms (including conversion). Of those 117, 64 deal only with matters pertaining to individual faculty, 27 deal only with collective workforce matters, and 26 deal with both. Thus only 53 contracts in my sample of 183 constrain managerial discretion in shaping the faculty workforce profile as a collectivity.

Professional Stratification: Part-Time Faculty's Conditions of Employment

Gradations of status for inclusion in collective bargaining. As is emphasized in the existing literature, "part-time faculty" is far from a monolithic category. Part-timers are defined in various ways in the contracts in terms of who is included in the bargaining unit, pointing to numerous fine-tuned gradations in job status. Generally, the strata are related to faculty members' course load. In my sample, nearly two-thirds (64%) of the contracts cover at least some part-timers, split fairly evenly between those that did and did not specify restrictions on part-timers included in the bargaining unit. Such restrictions, defined by percentages of full-time load or by number of course hours, ranged from three-quarter or more to two-thirds or more to 50% or more to 20% or more, and from 4 credit hours per week to 8 or more hours to 19 hours to 30 hours or more. In three contracts, hourly faculty were included. In a few cases, inclusion was defined by type of course taught: credit courses were included, continuing education or night courses were not.

The clearest classes of part-time faculty defined in the literature and in surveys are "regular" and "temporary," but even these classifications are murky and lack definitive national standards. In fact, the latter category was so problematic that it was not used in reports of the 1993 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty. Generally, the former category refers to those part-time faculty with a substantial course load and with some continuity of service in the institution. "Regular" part-time faculty are by far the most likely to be covered in contracts, and they account for roughly 69% of part-time faculty. However, far fewer part- than full-time faculty — 10% versus 23% — are unionized [23].[11] And the proportion of part-timers has grown considerably since 1970 (see Table 1).

The literature suggests that the limited representation of part-time faculty is largely a result of the reluctance of full-time faculty to include them in bargaining units [15]. Yet institutions have also resisted including part-timers in bargaining units. Inclusion is also a function of state statute (which varies by state) and of National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) rulings (which vary over time) on the eligibility of part-time faculty [5, 16]. Gradations of professional status, then, are partly matters of legal judgment.

Regardless of the cause of unit membership, as noted in opening the article, the scope of the bargaining unit affects what can be negotiated. In considering contract provisions having to do with the conditions of

TABLE 1
Full- and Part-Time Senior Instructional Faculty (thousands) Selected Years, 1970–1991

Year	Total *N*	Full-Time *N*	Part-Time *N*	Part-Time %
1970	474	369	104	21.9
1972	500	380	120	24.0
1974	567	406	161	28.4
1976	633	434	199	31.4
1979	675	445	230	34.1
1980	686	450	236	34.4
1982	710	462	248	34.9
1984	717	462	255	35.6
1986	722	459	263	36.4
1987*	793	523	270	34.0
1991	826	536	291	35.2

SOURCE: National Center for Education Statistics, Digest of Education Statistics, 1994.
*Data prior to 1987 are not directly comparable due to a change in survey methods (that accounts for the big shift in numbers).

work, there are limits to what units covering only full-time faculty can negotiate. Thus, in opening the discussion of each type of provision I speak to the issue of unit scope and the possibility as well as probability of full-time only units negotiating provisions affecting part-time faculty. Notwithstanding such limitations and likelihoods, full-time only units have negotiated each of the provisions I consider.

Contractual conditions of employment: Rights/perquisites. By far the most common condition of employment defined for part-time faculty in the contracts are Rights/perquisites. Such conditions are found in 74 contracts. Thus, nearly two-thirds of the 211 contracts in the HECAS database do *not* accord part-time faculty *any* of the Rights/perquisites accorded full-time faculty. Only 39% of the 188 contracts that address part-timers in some respect speak to their Rights/perquisites.

Of the 74 contracts that define some Rights/perquisites for part-time faculty, 8 involve negative references, explicitly denying part-timers certain Rights/perquisites. For example, part-timers are excluded from basic work provisions such as sick leaves, insurance, retraining, and due process rights to grievance and arbitration. Such negative references simply explicate what is in fact the case in most contracts by virtue of omission.[12]

As one would expect, the contracts least likely to provide part-timers with Rights/perquisites are those that cover only full-time faculty. Of 65 contracts that mention part-timers but cover only full-timers, only 6 have provisions that provide part-time faculty with Rights/perquisites. There is a dependent association between these clauses and unit mem-

bership ($\chi^2 = 31.31$, significant at the 0.000 level). Another 3 such contracts explicitly deny professional privileges to part-time faculty (of 8 such negative references, 5 are in contracts that cover full- and part-time faculty).

Nevertheless, there is a striking absence of defined privileges even in those contracts that cover at least some part-time faculty. Of 74 references to part-timers' Rights/perquisites, 9 are in full-time only contracts. Another 5 references in contracts that cover part-timers explicitly deny them such rights. Thus, of 118 contracts that cover at least some part-timers, nearly half (58 contracts — 49%) do *not* speak to these faculty's Rights/perquisites.

As in the case of workforce provisions, there is evidence of gradations among part-time faculty, in addition to the distinctions between them and full-timers. For example, the Jackson Community College contract indicates that there is some insurance coverage for part-time faculty, but not for those who are not on annual and continuing contracts. That makes explicit what is true for virtually all contracts that cover only certain categories of part-time faculty — some grades of part-time faculty are excluded.

The most common categories of Rights/perquisites in the 146 references in 74 contracts have to do with leaves (39), insurance/benefits (38), professional development (10), tuition waivers (9) and workspace (8). The extent of omission with respect to particular Rights/perquisites is striking. Moreover, part-timers' access to certain basic Rights/perquisites has declined relative to Leslie and Ikenberry's [15] findings that nearly two-thirds of the contracts provide sick leave and nearly one-half provide insurance benefits. Finally, the literature on improving the use of part-time faculty, enabling them to better contribute to the quality of educational programs, emphasizes integrating such faculty into the lives of the units in which they teach. Significantly, only 10 contracts provide some sort of professional development opportunity or support to part-time faculty, only 8 ensure the provision of workspace, and none enfranchises part-time faculty in the academic decision making of their units.

The incidence of Rights/perquisites provisions overall is independent of institutional type ($\chi^2 = 1.36$). However, there is a dependent association between provisions for leaves and institutional type. Conducting a chi-square analysis including all 183 contracts in my sample, the statistical association is not significant ($\chi^2 = 3.84$). Collapsing two-year and technical colleges into one category, the association is significant at the .1 level ($\chi^2 = 3.71$). It might be more appropriate, though, given that few full-time only contracts have such provisions, to eliminate

them from the analysis. In that case, for the 118 contracts that cover full- and part-time faculty there is a dependent relationship between Leave provisions and institutional type ($\chi^2 = 6.08$, significant at the 0.05 level). Two-year colleges and technical colleges are overrepresented: 79% of such provisions are in two-year, and 11% in technical college contracts, whereas 68% and 8% of the sample population contracts are in these institutional types. Four-year institutions are underrepresented, accounting for only 11% of Leave clauses, as compared to 24% of the sample population. That finding runs counter to prevailing assumptions about conditions of work and professional privileges in four-year versus in two-year institutions.

Contractual conditions of employment: Duties. What is expected of part-time faculty? As another indicator of such faculty's integration into the academic life of the units in which they teach, I coded contractual provisions regarding their Duties. Only 39 contracts have such provisions — 3 of these are negative references. What is explicit for those 3 contracts, which do *not* require part-time faculty to hold office hours and do *not* require them to be evaluated, holds true for the great majority (83%) of the 211 contracts in the HECAS system. It holds true for 80% of the 183 contracts in my sample and for 69% of the contracts that cover at least some part-time faculty (only 2 full-time only contracts define duties for part-timers). That is quite a contrast to the 56% of contracts that Leslie and Ikenberry [15] found to have specified procedures for regular performance evaluation, and that with a large proportion of contracts covering only full-time faculty.

The incidence of Duties provisions is independent of institutional type ($\chi^2 = 1.87$). As with the findings for Right/perquisites provisions, this runs counter to assumptions and expectations about the conditions of employment and professional responsibilities of faculty in four- versus two-year institutions. Duties are relatively undefined in either sector — 32.5% of contracts in two-year colleges that cover full- and part-timers, and 34.5% of contracts in four-year institutions that cover full- and part-timers.

By far the most commonly mentioned duties in the contracts are that part-time faculty be evaluated (21 contracts) and that they hold office hours (14 contracts). (Being evaluated is classified as a duty — or professional responsibility — rather than a right because the provisions do not offer part-timers the right of evaluation as a means to ensure salary increases or reappointment.) Only 5 of the 39 contracts that speak to part-timers' duties fail to mention either being evaluated or holding office hours. Some Duties provisions speak to noninstructional matters

such as attending orientation, graduation, and parents' weekend, and participating in faculty meetings.

Yet, there is not much detail in the definition of duties, even when they are mentioned. For example, most of the references to being evaluated are made in a sentence or two. Two exceptions point to the significance of this pattern, for there is much about evaluation that should be defined.

> In conjunction with the department personnel committee or, where one does not exist, any other appropriate mechanism, the department chairperson/head and academic administrative officials, as appropriate shall evaluate part-time faculty at least once annually on an appropriate form. The form will provide an appropriate space for the evaluation of any assigned duties other than teaching. During a part-time faculty member's annual review, the departmental personnel committee or, where one does not exist, any other appropriate mechanism shall examine the part-time faculty member's performance in teaching, including student evaluations. Each department shall develop or adopt one of several forms appropriate to the evaluation of part-time teaching in that department, as well as procedures for the administration of student evaluations of part-time teaching. Upon the request of a part-time faculty member, the chair of the departmental personnel committee or, where one does not exist, any other appropriate mechanism, or the chairperson/head shall meet once with the part-time faculty member to discuss or obtain information with regard to the faculty member's performance and/or the written comments already provided. Each part-time faculty member retains the right to respond in writing to any written comments by any individual or group of individuals on his/her evaluation form and to have the response affixed to the evaluation (Sections 21.5–21.7, University of Massachusetts, Amherst).
>
> While administrators will strive to evaluate part-time faculty as often as possible, the frequency of the evaluation will be determined by the divisional dean or his/her designee. During the first teaching assignment, each new part-time faculty member will be observed in the classroom by his/her immediate supervisor or other individual(s) designated by the divisional dean. It is expressly understood that this first observation is for the purpose of assisting the faculty member and is not valuative. The supervisor may recommend additional supportive resources to promote teaching excellence and enhance student success. Part-time faculty members to be evaluated will be given reasonable advance notice. The criteria and methodology to be used in the evaluation will be determined and published by the divisional dean or his/her designee as early in the academic year as possible. Before earning associate continuing status, each part-time faculty member must have at least one formal evaluation (Article V.F.2, Lansing Community College).

The details in the two contracts above clarify the significance of what is missing in other contracts. They also point to the existence of con-

siderable managerial discretion even in the context of such detailed provisions. From the standpoint of part-time faculty it is desirable to have various conditions surrounding evaluation well defined as a matter of due process protection. Similarly, from the standpoint of the profession, some definition of regular review of part-time faculty is desirable in order to ensure professional treatment of instructors and to maintain professional standards. Yet as they stand, contracts leave managers broad discretion to decide whether, by whom, how, and to what ends evaluation of part-time faculty will be done. There are virtually no professional constraints on managers in the contracts.

The relative absence in the contracts of defined duties for part-timers highlights the fact that with the exception of holding office hours (12% of the 118 contracts that cover full- and part-time faculty) such faculty have virtually no noninstructional obligations. Part-timers' work responsibilities are delimited more narrowly than are those of full-timers. As increasing numbers of part-timers are hired, the faculty workforce is being deskilled, in terms not only of certification, but also of the nature of work being performed. Part-time faculty simply deliver instruction (and contracts do not ensure much guidance or review by managers or by full-time faculty). Such a pattern offers little room for professional growth and development; it offers a direct contrast to the literature that calls for the integration of part-time faculty members into the academic life of the unit in which they work.

Conditions of employment: Experience. As a more direct measure of whether part-time teaching is regarded as professional work I studied whether such Experience is credited in calculating eligibility for any of a range of contractual considerations (e.g., salary scale, time toward sabbatical). Such experience is mentioned in less than one-third (31%) of the contracts that mention part-timers. In the 58 contracts in which it is mentioned, there are 95 references, over one-fourth of which (27%) are negative. Negative references explicitly indicate that faculty are not credited for time spent teaching part-time. Teaching part-time, then, is not generally treated in the contracts as professional experience. (Of course, in community colleges, in some states and fields, part-time faculty who have been employed by the institution for some time have an inside track on hiring for full-time positions — not formally, but informally.)

As might be expected, part-time experience is most likely to be overlooked in contracts that cover full-time faculty only. There is a dependent association between such clauses and unit membership ($\chi^2 = 4.79$, significant at the 0.05 level). Full-time-faculty-only contracts represent 36% of agreements in the HECAS population that mention part-timers,

but only 24% of those that have Experience provisions. Interestingly, however, such contracts are no more likely than are contracts covering full- and part-time faculty to have negative references to experience (χ^2= 1.91). Incidence of Experience provisions, or of negative references to Experience, are not dependent on institutional type (χ^2s = 0.34, 0.735 respectively).

Conditions of employment: Priority. The provisions described above make explicit what holds true for virtually all of the contracts: full-time faculty take priority over part-timers, whose terms of labor are qualitatively different than those of full-time faculty. To underscore the extent of that priority, I studied direct contractual references according full-time faculty Priority over part-timers. Although one would expect that the contracts of full-time faculty only would be the most likely to have Priority clauses, a chi-square analysis reveals that there is no dependent association between the incidence of these clauses and unit membership (χ^2 = 0.67). Nor is there a dependent association between the clauses and institutional type (χ^2 = 0.65).

Of the 33 contracts speaking to Priority, only 3 protect the rights of part-timers. For example, two contracts give part-time faculty priority in the filling of full-time positions, though the clauses vary in their strength.

> Part-time faculty members of the bargaining unit shall be given consideration in the filling of teaching vacancies within the university which may occur within their fields of competence (Article K.2, Roger Williams University).
>
> [P]referential consideration for new appointments to the rank of full-time faculty shall be given to the most senior part-time faculty member who applies (Article 19.4, Erie Community College).

A third contract (Franklin Pierce College) protects the course assignments of part-time faculty with at least six years of experience, excluding their courses from the overload list of courses that can be claimed by full-timers.

Virtually all of the Priority references are to some dimension of course assignment. (Priority in the makeup of the workforce, layoff order and in terms of Rights/perquisites and experience have already been discussed.) The most common provisions have to do with course assignment in general (18 of 55 total references) and overload assignments (13 references). Full-time faculty are given ownership of their regular courses or the right to claim overload courses before part-time faculty are assigned. Some provisions relate to course assignments that lie outside the mainstream, regular academic curriculum. For example,

5 references are to summer session courses, 3 are to continuing education courses, 2 to evening courses, and 1 each to adult education and off-contract courses. Of course, these curricular areas are where part-time faculty are most likely to be found.

Such provisions might be read as pointing to areas of the curriculum in which part-timers and full-timers compete for courses. Given that all but one of the 31 contracts give priority in these matters to full-time faculty, such provisions might also be read as pointing to full-timers' ownership of the curriculum. However, 83% of the contracts that mention part-timers, and 85% of all the contracts, do *not* establish such course priority. The percentages are obviously even higher with respect to summer session, continuing education, evening, adult education, and off-contract courses. In other words, full-timers lack contractual claims on a wide range of curricula. To the extent that there is a contest over curricular realms, it has been decided, and the decision lies in the hands of managers. The relative absence of provisions about course priority leaves discretion in the hands of managers, with little formal professional constraints in the contracts.

In sum, one powerful indicator of part-time faculty's professional position is the extent to which conditions of employment are undefined for *any* categories of part-timers, despite the inclusion of at least some part-time faculty in 118 contracts. Managerial discretion is extensive, because few professional constraints are built into the contracts. Further, part-time faculty's conditions of employment make for a significant contrast with the conditions that attach to full-time faculty's employment. Finally, the Rights/perquisites and Duties clauses in particular point to divisions and gradations among part-timers.

Discussion

Restructuring activities in American higher education involve more than retrenching individual faculty. Strategic decisions about institutions' academic directions are also consequential choices about the distribution and nature of the faculty workforce and of the professional workforce in general in academe [8, 27, 33]. A significant dimension of restructuring that workforce is the increased ratio of part- to full-time faculty. Here, I have addressed two questions about contractual conditions applying to part-time faculty in 211 collectively bargained agreements. Both questions speak to the politics of professional work, exploring negotiated conditions affecting the control and organization of part-time faculty members in unionized academe.

First, I ask: To what extent do collectively bargained faculty contracts provide for managerial discretion or professional constraint re-

garding the use of part-time faculty? The analytical focus of this question is on the formal negotiation between managers and faculty (full- and part-time) over the control and shape of the professional workforce. Yet, I also gain insight into the stratification between full- and part-time faculty, as evidenced in the respective rights and claims of these faculty in workforce actions.

In answer to the first research question, I find that there is extensive managerial discretion built into the contracts. A major source of discretion is the omission of conditions regarding Appointment/Release and workforce actions as they relate to part-time faculty. Over three-quarters (80%) of the 211 HECAS contracts (and 77% of the 183 contracts that address part-timers) do not define conditions of Appointment/Release for part-time faculty. The job rights of part-timers, and of full relative to part-timers, in individual workforce actions are undefined in 59% of the HECAS contracts (and 52% of the contracts that address part-timers). Over three-quarters (80%) of the HECAS contracts (and 77% of the contracts that address part-timers) do not have collective workforce provisions that limit managerial discretion in relation to part-time faculty.

Moreover, considerable managerial discretion is evident in deem clauses, found in 21% of the collective workforce provisions and in the 10 contracts that allow for the conversion of full to part-time lines. There is also much discretion in exceptions to defined conditions. For example, virtually all of the individual workforce provisions having to do with order of layoff — the most common of such conditions — give managers the right to violate that order. Finally, many collective workforce provisions except particular areas of the curriculum.

By contrast I find only limited professional constraints built into the contracts. Workforce provisions are generally *not* absolute conditions that eliminate managerial discretion. Virtually no conditions provide faculty or the union discretion in determining the application of conditions or exceptions. Fewer than 5% define Rights of part-time faculty, contractually protecting them from managers' arbitrary actions.

Over time managers have increased the number and proportion of part-time faculty, a category of worker over which managers have greater discretion and full-time faculty have little control. The relative lack of standard professional processes and job rights for part-time faculty and their subordinate position, as defined in workforce matters suggests that this growing category of faculty is less professionalized than full-timers.

Chi-square analyses of the data reveal that, to some extent, the incidence of workforce provisions is associated with institutional type and unit membership. There are dependent associations between three types

of workforce provisions — Appointment/release, Individual workforce, and Collective workforce provisions that provide professional constraints — and institutional type. Four-year institutions are overrepresented in the Individual and Collective workforce provisions, although not for the specific categories *within* these two types (e.g., Order, Ratio). That suggests that somewhat stronger professional limitations on managerial discretion exist in the four-year than in the two-year sector of higher education. Technical colleges are underrepresented (in fact, missing) in Appointment/release clauses. There are also dependent associations between Appointment/release, Individual workforce Recall, and Individual workforce Reassignment clauses, and unit membership. In the first two cases, contracts covering only full-time faculty are underrepresented. Yet in the latter case, such contracts are overrepresented. Thus no clear pattern emerges.

My second research question is: To what extent are the conditions of employment for part-time faculty different from those of full-time faculty? The analytical focus of this question is on the formal stratification of full- and part-time faculty. However, I also gain insight into the discretion afforded managers in utilizing part-timers, as evidenced in the relative lack of clauses defining professional terms of work.

In answer to the second research question, I find that the conditions of employment for part-time faculty are relatively undefined. The most common condition — Rights/perquisites — is undefined in 65 percent of HECAS contracts (and in 60% of the 183 contracts that address part-timers). Moreover, the Rights/perquisites of part-time faculty that are defined are very limited. Only 17% of HECAS contracts (and 20% of the contracts that address part-timers, and 31% of the contracts that include part-timers as unit members) define part-timers' Duties outside the classroom — generally, holding office hours and being evaluated. The work of part-timers is for the most part delimited to instruction. This delimitation is a major dimension of deprofessionalization, and it is augmented by managers' extensive discretion in whether and how to evaluate part-timers. Professional processes for evaluating quality and rewarding merit and professional control of such processes are lacking. The professional standing of part-timers is explicit in the failure of nearly three-quarters (73.5%) of HECAS contracts (and 68% of contracts that address part-timers) to even mention part-time teaching Experience in calculating eligibility for a range of contractual considerations). Over one-quarter (27%) of the contractual references to Experience are negative. That is, teaching part-time is not credited as professional experience. The professionally subordinate position of part-time faculty is distinctly defined in the 15% of HECAS contracts

(and 17% of contracts that address part-timers) that give Priority to full- over part-time faculty in course assignment matters. In short, the contracts point to the deprofessionalized conditions of part-time relative to full-time faculty's employment, and to managers' extensive discretion in the contracts in dealing with part-timers. The contracts also point to the existence of gradations of part-time faculty.

Chi-square analyses reveal a dependent association between various conditions of employment and unit membership. (Only one type of clause — leaves — has a dependent association with institutional type; such clauses are more likely in two-year and technical colleges.) Provisions that address part-timers' Rights/perquisites, Duties, and Experience are dependent on unit membership, with contracts covering only full-time faculty underrepresented. That is as one would expect. As noted earlier, there are legal limitations to what units covering only full-time faculty can bargain; yet, some full-time-only units bargained each of the above provisions. Moreover, contrary to expectations, Priority provisions are *not* dependent on unit membership. Units covering full- and part-time faculty are as likely as units covering full-time faculty only to define full-timers' priority over all part-time faculty.

In the literature, the subordinate position of part-time faculty has been attributed to full-time faculty seeking to protect their professional position(s) [6,15]. The above findings, individual and collective workforce provisions that establish full-timers' priority in workforce actions, and collective workforce provisions that set limits on the numbers and/or proportion of part-time faculty, might be read as confirming that view. Yet, faculty unions nationally promote the improved treatment of part-time faculty [1]. Moreover, institutions nationally are reducing the benefits of all faculty. Further, part-time faculty are often used by managers precisely because such faculty are cheaper and because managers have more flexibility in hiring and releasing part- relative to full-time faculty. Currently, managers are seeking to further reduce limiting professional constraints on workforce actions. Thus, management shares much of the responsibility for part-time faculty's conditions of employment. Indeed, in the negotiation process managers could grant enhanced conditions of employment to enhance the quality of these employees' working conditions without requiring some concession from full-timers (after all, some such conditions are revenue neutral). However, it is in managers' interests to maintain discretion in utilizing part-timers.

There is still much empirical detail about part-time faculty that is lacking and that is required in order to explore more fully the politics of professional work. Past typologies of part-timers have provided

some useful insight into categories of part-timers. Similar work is required to disaggregate further the work and experience of part-time faculty. For example, to what extent are part-time faculty employed in the teaching of undergraduate and lower division students and to what extent are they concentrated in particular fields in particular types of institutions? The 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty provides information about the principal activities of different types of faculty but does not break those activities down beyond teaching, research, administration, and other [22]. Thus we cannot track patterns in teaching undergraduates and lower division students. Such disaggregated patterns would enable us to explore another aspect of stratification and deskilling in the faculty workforce.

Similarly, we need to disaggregate by field of study by institutional type so that we can explore yet another facet of deskilling and intraprofessional hierarchy. At present, there are tabular data on aggregated numbers of part-time faculty in particular fields. As one might expect, there are a higher percentage of part-time faculty in some career-oriented fields, such as business (38%), education (37%), law (54%), and occupationally specific programs (43%), than in the natural sciences (30%) and social sciences (29%) [22] (although there are other professional fields that have relatively low numbers of part-time faculty, such as engineering, 24%, and nursing, 26%). There are also relatively high percentages of part-timers in arts and science departments that bear heavy general education and service course responsibilities, such as English (41%) and mathematics (41%). Data by institutional type would allow us to track such trends over time by higher education sector. The point is that restructuring the faculty workforce is a disaggregated phenomenon.

Important empirical questions remain as to how managers exercise their discretion in the use of part-time faculty, especially in times of financial stress. Disaggregating the data by institutional type raises some interesting corollaries of that question. At present published data from the National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty [22] are incomplete, based on numbers from the "faculty," and not the "institutional" survey, with the numbers of part-time faculty identified in the faculty survey being somewhat lower than estimates derived from the institutional survey. Nevertheless, even these conservative estimates of part-time faculty numbers suggest that overall the percentage of part-time faculty has remained fairly stable from 1987 to the present. In itself, this runs contrary to the view that in times of financial difficulty managers will cut large numbers of part-timers before they will touch full-time faculty. It is worth noting that in a previous time of financial crisis in

higher education, 1972-77, the proportion of part-time faculty increased substantially, from 24% to 33.9% of the total faculty workforce. Currently, we lack the time perspective that we have on the 1970s. However, a comparison of 1988 NCES data with 1993 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty data reveals that in some institutional sectors — private research, public doctoral, private comprehensive, and public two-year — the proportion of part-time faculty has increased (3.3, 1.8, 7.4, and 1.3 percentage points, respectively, representing increases of 15%, 10.5%, 23%, and 2.5%); in others — public research, private doctoral, and private liberal arts — the proportion of part-timers has decreased (1.4, 9.8, and 1.6 percentage points, respectively, representing increases of 10%, 23%, and 5%) [22, 23]. At this point the results are preliminary and suggestive, but they raise key questions. Why the differences by sector? Why have the numbers of part-time faculty increased in some sectors but not in others, particularly as the variations cut across public/private institutions and within the research and doctoral institution sectors?

In closing, future research should address such reorganization issues in the context not just of the faculty workforce but of higher education's professional workforce in general. In addition to an increased proportion of part-time faculty in the last quarter of the twentieth century, there is a related decrease in the proportion of professional workers in higher education who are faculty: in 1977, 64% of higher education's professional workforce were faculty members; by 1989, that figure had dropped to 55% [19]. The number of nonfaculty support professionals has mushroomed, not only in central administration but in academic colleges [17, 26, 28]. Moreover, almost all administrative and nonfaculty professional positions in academe are full-time. We are witnessing a substantial challenge to the professional position of the established academic profession and the professionalization of a range of new support and administrative occupations in the academy whose work is increasingly central to institutions of higher education. These nonfaculty professionals are less likely than faculty to be unionized and more likely than faculty to identify and align themselves with management. Their hiring, evaluation, firing, and conditions of work are more directly controlled by management. American colleges and universities are increasing their numbers and proportion of part-time faculty at the same time they are increasing the numbers and proportion of full-time administrators and nonfaculty professionals, suggesting a shift in the configuration of professional and production work in American higher education. (Despite a historical pattern to the contrary [24], indications are that some European countries are moving in the same direction,

building increasingly larger campus bureaucracies even as the number of faculty levels out or declines.) In American higher education, faculty are increasingly "managed" professionals in organizations increasingly run by "managerial professionals."

Notes

[1]Slaughter [36] suggests that job autonomy was bought at a price. Moreover, faculty themselves have violated the academic freedom of other faculty throughout higher education's history, whether the issues (and "isms") at stake were trade unionism and populism, pacifism, syndicalism, socialism and communism, feminism, the Vietnam War, other social movements, or simply divergent scientific paradigms [14, 31, 35, 36].

[2]See Rhoades [29] for a similar analytical focus on managerial discretion and professional constraint in contracts' retrenchment clauses.

[3]In assuming that unions are fundamentally different from and even antithetical to professionalism, this literature disregards the insight of professionalization theory's progenitor — the designation "profession" is a subjective valuation of society, not a set of objective characteristics [11].

[4]I follow Hughes' [11] view that one can best understand occupations by first studying them in their least prestigious forms. As one reader pointed out, the AAUP's statement on nontenure track faculty refers to them as a "barometer" of the profession's status. Of course, others might suggest that the elite status of full-time faculty in more prestigious universities has been maintained at the expense of faculty and teaching personnel in less prestigious institutions and in less secure professional statuses — e.g., part-timers, instructors, graduate teaching assistants. Yet, that is simply another way of interpreting and saying that to understand elite sectors of a profession, one must also consider the less or nonelite sectors of a profession.

[5]Elsewhere [26] I develop the idea that managerial occupations in higher education have become professionalized, as have various other nonfaculty occupations in colleges and universities. The distinction between professionals and managers that is found in the literature and in case law (e.g., the Yeshiva case) does not hold empirically, for the managers have themselves professionalized in classic ways (e.g., formation of associations with annual meetings and journals).

[6]Nationally, the NEA is the bargaining agent for about 66% of contracts in two-year colleges. Leslie and Ikenberry [15] found that the NEA represents about 53% of all units that include part-time faculty (compared to about 41% of units overall). By contrast, the AAUP and AFT, which represented about 12 and 31%, respectively, of all units, accounted for 11% and 28% of units including part-timers.

[7]There are, of course, procedures and practices that coexist with the bargaining agreement that are not directly referenced in the contract. There are also many contracts with past practice clauses. In a data sample of this size, it is not feasible to pursue the extent to which such unreferenced procedures provide substantial professional protection. Indeed, none of the major contract studies in the literature undertake such an analysis. More importantly, there is no evidence in the literature of the force of such non-contractual procedures. Quite the contrary. Case law, and the efforts of national unions to inscribe such matters as layoff procedures in formal collective bargaining agreements suggest the importance of such contractual provisions. Indeed, as has been shown in a previous analysis [29] contractual provisions are most evident and strongest in precisely those settings which are more likely to have faculty governance procedures that preceded unionization — e.g., in four-versus in two-year institutions. At the very least, it may be said that provisions that are written into contracts provide a greater level of professional protection and a greater level of professional constraint on managerial discretion than do procedures not embedded or referenced in the contract.

[8]As anyone familiar with the limitations of data on part-time faculty knows, it is not feasible (particularly in a sample this size) to determine how many part-time faculty are represented in the different contracts.

[9]In some of the contracts (about 15%), the language in the retrenchment clause refers to some or all part-time faculty indirectly or residually. For example, layoff order might give preference to permanent contract faculty over fixed term, non-renewable contract faculty. However, many such references are vague — for example, they refer to the priority of tenured faculty over nontenured and other. In coding, I decided that it was significant whether part-timers were identified explicitly in matters such as order of layoff.

[10]If the cells of two-year and technical colleges are collapsed together, there is a dependent association between the incidence of Ratio provisions and institutional type ($\chi^2 = 4.25$, significant at 0.05 level). However, the association is not dependent for either Order ($\chi^2 = 0.82$) or Replacement ($\chi^2 = 1.9$) provisions.

[11]Nationwide, 9% of the institutions surveyed in 1987–88 had part-time faculty bargaining units [22]. In my sample there are 5 contracts for part-timers only. As one would expect, they provide more detailed discussion of terms of employment than is found in contracts covering both full- and part-timers (or only full-time faculty): for example, they all define conditions of appointment/release. Yet the contracts are limited in their provisions and protections. Many of the sections and much of the detail found in agreements covering full-time faculty are missing in part-timers' agreements.

[12]Of course, what this cross-sectional analysis of contracts does not reveal is the general decline over time in colleges and universities' provisions of fringe benefits for full as well as part-time faculty. Hutchinson Community College's contract offers a variation of such benefits deductions, in the form of a two-tier contract. New part-timers will not get a Right/perquisite enjoyed by current part-time faculty.

References

1. AAUP. "Report: On the Status of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty." *Academe*, 78 (1992), 39–48.
2. Abbott, A. *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.
3. Biles, G. E., and H. P. Tuckman. *Part-Time Faculty Personnel Management Policies.* New York, London: American Council on Education/Macmillan, Collier Macmillan, 1986.
4. Brint. S. *In an Age of Experts: The Changing Role of Professionals in Politics and Public Life.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994.
5. Gappa, J. M. *Part-Time Faculty: Higher Education at a Crossroads.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No.3, Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1984.
6. Gappa, J. M., and D. W. Leslie. *The Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part-Timers in Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993.
7. Gouldner, A. "Locals and Cosmopolitans." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1 (1957), 444-80.
8. Gumport, P. "The Contested Terrain of Academic Program Reduction." *Journal of Higher Education*, 64 (May/June 1993), 283–311.
9. Heinz, J. P., and E. O. Laumann. *Chicago Lawyers: The Social Structure of the Bar.*

New York and Chicago: Russell Sage Foundation and American Bar Foundation, 1982.

10. Hoffman, L. M. *The Politics of Knowledge: Activist Movements in Medicine and Planning*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989.
11. Hughes, E. C. *Men and Their Work*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958.
12. Jencks, C., and D. Riesman. *The Academic Revolution*. New York: Doubleday, 1968.
13. Julius, D. J., and M. K. Chandler. "Academic Bargaining Agents in Higher Education: Do Their Achievements Differ?" *Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector*, 18 (1989), 9–58.
14. Kuhn, T. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
15. Leslie, D. W., and D. J. Ikenberry. "Collective Bargaining and Part-Time Faculty: Contract Content." *CUPA Journal*, 30 (1979), 18–26.
16. Leslie, D. W., S. E. Kellams, and G. M. Gunne. *Part-Time Faculty in American Higher Education*. New York: Praeger, 1982.
17. Leslie, L., and G. Rhoades. "Rising Administrative Costs: Seeking Explanations." *Journal of Higher Education*, 66 (March/April 1995), 187–212.
18. Metzger, W. "The Academic Profession in the United States." In *The Academic Profession: National, Disciplinary, and Institutional Settings*, edited by B. R. Clark. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987.
19. Montgomery, D. C., and G. L. Lewis. "Administrative Staff: Salaries and Issues." *The NEA 1995 Almanac of Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1995.
20. Mortimer, K. P., M. Bagshaw, and A. T. Masland. *Flexibility in Academic Staffing: Effective Policies and Practices*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No.1. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1985.
21. NCES. *Digest of Education Statistics*. National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1994.
22. NCES. *Faculty and Instructional Staff: Who Are They and What Do They Do?* Survey Report of 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 1994.
23. NCES. *Faculty in Higher Education Institutions*. National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988.
24. Neave, G., and G. Rhoades. "The Academic Estate in Western Europe." In *The Academic Profession: National, Disciplinary, and Institutional Settings*, edited by B. R. Clark. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987.
25. Perkin, H. *The Rise of Professional Society: England since 1880*. London and New York: Routledge, 1989.
26. Rhoades, G. "Rising, Stratified Administrative Costs: The Place of Student Services." In *New Directions for Student Services: Budgeting as a Tool for Restructuring*, edited by D. Woodard. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995.

27. Rhoades, G. "Rethinking Restructuring." *Journal for Higher Education Management,* 10 (1995), 17–31.

28. Rhoades, G. "Rising Administrative Costs in Instructional Units." *Thought and Action,* 11 (1995), 7–24.

29. Rhoades, G. "Retrenchment Clauses in Faculty Union Contracts: Faculty Rights and Administrative Discretion." *Journal of Higher Education,* 64 (May/June 1993), 312–147.

30. Rhoades, G., and S. Slaughter. "Professors, Administrators, and Patents: The Negotiation of Technology Transfer." *Sociology of Education,* 64 (1991), 65–77.

31. Schrecker, E. *No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

32. Silva, E. T., and S. Slaughter. *Serving Power: The Making of a Social Science Expert, 1865–1921.* Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1984.

33. Slaughter, S. "Retrenchment in the 1980s: The Politics of Gender." *Journal of Higher Education,* 64 (May/June 1993), 250–82.

34. Slaughter, S. *The Higher Learning and High Technology: Dynamics of Higher Education Policy Formation.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.

35. Slaughter, S. "Academic Freedom in the 1980s." In *Higher Education in American Society,* edited by P. G. Altbach and R. O. Berdahl. Rev. ed. Buffalo, New York: Prometheus, 1988.

36. Slaughter, S. "The 'Danger Zone': Academic Freedom and Civil Liberties." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* 448 (1980), 46–61.

37. Slaughter, S., and G. Rhoades. "The Emergence of a Competitiveness Research and Development Policy Coalition and the Commercialization of Academic Science and Technology." *Science, Technology, and Human Values,* 21(3) (1996), 303–39.

38. Starr, P. *The Social Transformation of American Medicine.* New York: Basic Books, 1982.

39. Tuckman, H. P. "Who is Part-Time in Academe?" *AAUP Bulletin,* 64 (1978), 305–15.

40. Williams, G. W., and P. A. Zirkel. "Academic Penetration in Collective Bargaining Contracts in Higher Education." *Research in Higher Education,* 28 (1988), 76–95.

41. Witz, A. *Professions and Patriarchy.* London and New York: Routledge, 1992.

Glen J. Godwin
William T. Markham

First Encounters of the Bureaucratic Kind

Early Freshman Experiences with a Campus Bureaucracy

As the dominant organizational form in our society [17], bureaucracy provides the framework within which much everyday activity takes place [38], shaping and constraining the behavior of most everyone [10, 25]. Learning to operate in a bureaucracy is therefore a crucial aspect of socialization [45, 25]. Yet adapting to bureaucratic roles is not always easy, especially for "lower participants" [11] in organizations, such as clients and ordinary employees [2, 25]. Lower participants may find themselves alienated [25], disempowered [8, 37], and confused or frustrated by bureaucratic dysfunctions [27] — ranging from red tape and rigidity [29] to communications breakdowns [9]. It is therefore not surprising that overt protests by lower participants stemming partly from dissatisfaction with bureaucratic requirements appear episodically, as in the case of the student revolts of the 1960s and 70s.

Nevertheless, despite occasional protests, the organizational landscape is clearly characterized more frequently by stability and acquiescence to bureaucracy than by sharp dissent. Several explanations for the widespread acceptance of bureaucracy despite its problems have been proposed. Bureaucracy may be less aggravating than sometimes claimed [36], or coercion and managerial chicanery may overcome resistance [10]. Mechanisms for compromising the interests of leaders and lower-participants may defuse conflict [7], or clients and employees may

We gratefully acknowledge the comments of Rebecca G. Adams and William E. Knox on earlier versions of this article.

Glen J. Godwin was a graduate student in sociology at the University of North Carolina, Greensboro, when this article was written; he is now working on a master's degree in divinity at the Duke Divinity School. William T. Markham is associate professor of sociology at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 67, No. 6 (November/December 1996)
Copyright 1996 by the Ohio State University Press

accept bureaucracy's disadvantages in return for a steady flow of benefits [18].

But despite its importance, the question of how and why lower participants come to give assent to bureaucratic requirements remains surprisingly neglected in research [25, 42], especially research in higher education. This study broadens our knowledge in this area through an in-depth study of an especially interesting set of lower participants — traditional-age college freshmen at a large state university. Its purpose is to determine how these students' interpretations of and adaptations to the campus bureaucracy allow the bureaucracy to remain stable and continue to function with few challenges and relatively little overt conflict — despite all the problems that bureaucracy is alleged to raise for clients. Answering this question requires an examination of the properties of bureaucracy and the problems it may present for students. It requires as well in-depth investigation of how students as bureaucratic clients develop understandings of the bureaucratic milieu, how they define their situations and options, how they negotiate patterns of interaction with their peers and superordinates, and how they cope with stresses that their experience with and adaptations to the bureaucracy engender.

Although newcomers to the university have been neglected in past studies of bureaucracy, this population is theoretically and practically strategic. Traditional-age freshmen are newcomers to a large and complex campus bureaucracy. Examining their emerging views of the bureaucracy and the patterns of action they develop to cope with it provides an especially clear view of the stresses built into bureaucratic roles — stresses to which more seasoned participants in the campus bureaucracy might already have become inured. By investigating the socializing experiences of newcomers, we gain insight into how patterns of acquiescence and coping become established — as well as how the pressures of bureaucracy occasionally lead to active resistance or exit from the university.

Furthermore, for many traditional-age freshmen, encounters with the campus bureaucracy are among their first *adult* experiences with bureaucracy, and for those without work experience in large organizations these encounters can be their very first. Learning to fit into a bureaucratic society is, of course, one part of the "hidden curriculum" of elementary and secondary schools [15, 19], but freshmen encounter bureaucracy in a new way — as adults. They must now transact business with strangers who provide minimal help and emotional support. They must assume more personal responsibility, and they receive fewer allowances for immaturity and inexperience. Consequently, young

adults' early encounters with bureaucracy can be difficult learning experiences, and their early interpretations of and adaptations to bureaucracy can set the pattern for later ones.

Our investigation has three parts. First, we reviewed existing literature about the problems that clients — especially newcomers — face adapting to bureaucracy. Past work on organizational socialization [45] and student life [33] is almost completely silent on this topic, but other bodies of work provide useful leads. We reviewed studies of dysfunctions of bureaucracy that confuse and frustrate clients, studies of client powerlessness and its effects, literature about how organizational actors go about defining their situations and the implications of their definitions, and studies of how clients negotiate their roles and adapt to bureaucracy.

Second, we conducted preliminary field observation of students as they encountered the campus bureaucracy in various university offices. These observations helped us to see how well issues and patterns described in the general literature about clients in bureaucracy applied to students on campus and identify unique issues that this particular bureaucracy poses for students. The observations also provided hints about how students define their experiences with the campus bureaucracy and direct information about their coping behaviors. We used this information in combination with ideas from the literature review to construct questions for subsequent interviews with Freshmen students and staff and as a validity check on students' reports about their dealings with the bureaucracy.

Finally, we conducted semistructured interviews with samples of traditional-age freshmen and staff in the offices that deal with them. The interviews with freshmen provide extensive information about their interpretations of the campus bureaucracy, the problems it posed for them, and their adaptations to it. The staff interviews provide the staff's insights about student behavior, and they also tell us how staff members' own views and behavior affect their interaction with students.

Bureaucratic Dysfunctions and Powerlessness as Problems for Clients in a Bureaucracy

Bureaucracies combine rules, specialization, hierarchy, impersonality, and records to create an orderly, efficient structure that processes work quickly [16, 35, 47]. Yet despite its vaunted efficiency, existing literature suggests that bureaucracy can also develop irritating and frustrating dysfunctions [9, 27]. Bureaucratic rules can become too numerous, rigid, conflicting, and confusing [9, 25, 27, 32]. Officials may

develop "bureaucratic personalities," placing more emphasis on rules than on client needs [29]. Clients may have to revisit offices repeatedly, endure long waits, and follow complex procedures. Proliferation of specialized departments can lead to poor coordination [23, 27], duplication of requests for information [25], to situations in which no one seems to have the authority or information to act effectively, and a tendency for departments to put their own priorities ahead of client needs [9, 27]. Powerful officials can impose onerous requirements that clients lack the power to contest [8]. Managers — who often lack substantive expertise but want to display their initiative nonetheless — may implement procedures that impede client service [9, 44, 49]. Bureaucratic impersonality can make clients feel poorly served or denigrated because their unique needs go unacknowledged [24], alienating them from officials and exacerbating tensions [25]. Impersonality also encourages officials to distance themselves emotionally from clients and rigidly follow procedures to avoid criticism [25, 29]. Finally, "red tape" can become oppressive, with endless forms to complete [1, 22, 25], errors in records can deprive clients of benefits, and staff may use paperwork requirements to control or punish clients [25, 42].

Bureaucracy can also subordinate individual independence to bureaucratic imperatives [2, 6, 7]. As lower participants, clients typically occupy roles with few resources for gaining power. Authority is delegated to staff [44, 47], who have authority over clients. Clients are often predisposed by past socialization to follow bureaucratic requirements, and they may be awed by officials' titles, presumed expertise, or symbols of authority [3, 44]. They also depend on staff for help in negotiating the system and reaching their goals [3, 25, 42], and bureaucratic procedures and appeals processes frequently make challenging the system difficult [25]. Clients thus often must forego their own preferences to conform to staff demands [8, 47]. Because managers, staff, and clients frequently have different goals, this power imbalance is problematic for clients [25]. Lack of power therefore has considerable potential to produce anxiety and frustration for clients.

Clients' Definitions of the Bureaucratic Situation

Bureaucratic dysfunctions and disempowerment thus pose a set of potential problems for bureaucratic clients, especially newcomers, to solve [46]. Newcomers must make sense of a new situation, decide what possibilities it offers, and negotiate their own roles and solutions to its challenges. We could locate no studies of how this process occurs among college students, but symbolic interaction theory [41, 46] and

scattered studies of clients in other bureaucracies provide some points of departure.

Symbolic interaction theory suggests that, in their initial encounters with bureaucracy, clients base their definitions of their situation on past experience and their own interpretation of their current experiences [5, 43]. They might also actively seek information about how to adapt to the system and reach their ends [25, 31]. The physical setting of offices, waiting areas, ropes, counters, and lines, might provide additional cues [5, 26, 30]. Clients cannot define situations capriciously, because the bureaucracies are highly structured and desired outcomes are more likely to accrue to those who fit into existing forms [46]. Nevertheless, bureaucracy never fully determines behavior, and clients' actions depend to a significant extent on their own definitions.

Defining situations and negotiating a solution to the problems that bureaucracy poses for them is often difficult for clients because their definitions of the situation do not agree with the world view of bureaucratic officials [24]. A client's emergency may be an official's routine problem, and paperwork and procedures that appear clear to bureaucrats may mystify clients [42]. Clients usually prefer personalized attention, but staff may be rewarded for adhering to procedure and fast processing of cases, not for providing personal attention [4, 29]. Understanding both clients' and officials' definitions is thus crucial for explaining how clients cope with bureaucracy.

Clients, Staff, and Negotiated Order

Symbolic interaction theory suggests that, based on their definitions of situation, clients and staff attempt to choose actions that let them interact successfully, reach their goals, play their roles as they understand them, maintain consistent and favorable self-images, and adapt to the situation [5, 21]. Research in other settings suggests that accomplishing this can pose a number of dilemmas for bureaucratic clients, who must decide how much inconvenience they will tolerate and how much autonomy they are willing to sacrifice to obtain services [39]. To the extent that bureaucracy causes them problems, clients must choose among strategies such as resisting bureaucratic controls, complaining about bureaucratic dysfunctions, questioning authority, learning about and embracing the requirements, or superficially acquiescing and "working the system" to reach their goals. Alternatively, they may choose to exit physically [25] or psychologically [2]. Staff also face choices. They may pursue their goals by instructing clients about rules and requirements and finding ways to control them [25]. They may make genuine

efforts to meet individual needs, or — pressured by understaffing, quantitative performance measures, or sanctions for breaking rules — they may become unresponsive, orient themselves toward quotas or minutiae, or withdraw psychologically [4, 25, 29]. How they resolve these dilemmas affects clients' situation.

Because clients are usually at a power disadvantage, the heavier burden of adjustment generally falls on them. They usually face strong pressure to acquaint themselves with bureaucratic procedures and follow them, even when doing so is unpleasant [18, 48]. Nevertheless, past research shows that clients are not without resources for balancing power informally [25, 28, 37]. They can cause inconvenience by filing appeals or grievances (which must be taken seriously in rule-bound environments) or disrupt operations by making a scene [25]. They also can become "prison lawyers," acquiring enough knowledge of the rules to argue their cases effectively. They can cultivate personal relationships with bureaucrats, enlist the support of powerful outsiders [25, 42], or cultivate styles of self-presentations that make them more persuasive [13, 14].

Despite the obstacles created by differing definitions of the situation or goals, existing research suggests that clients and staff often do develop understandings and strategies that let them adapt and accomplish many of their goals [4, 25, 48]. Although clients are at a power disadvantage, the patterns of interaction that emerge are generally negotiated, not imposed unilaterally by staff [14]. For bureaucracy to operate, the two groups need not have identical definitions of situation and goals, but they must develop a working consensus to follow patterns of behavior that lets interaction proceed [48]. For example, clients can appear to acquiesce, "playing along" with irritating requirements and hiding their frustration [14]. The organization can then continue to function despite underlying disagreements [48].

The Research Setting

Our case study of newcomers' adaptations to bureaucracy focuses on traditional-age freshmen at a state university with well over ten thousand students. We examine how these newcomers — some with little previous adult experience with bureaucracy — cope with a highly bureaucratized setting, which potentially presents freshmen with many of the problems described above. Our inquiry focuses on freshmen's experiences with four offices that most encounter almost immediately on arrival.

The *Registrar's Office* registers students for classes at a central site

in the Student Center. It handles preregistration, regular registration, and schedule adjustments. To register, a student must present a schedule card, signed by his or her faculty advisor. Registration is by appointment, so students usually wait less than 30 minutes, but waits can be much longer, especially during the "add/drop" period. Freshmen register last, so they are more likely to encounter closed classes, which become even more common during "add/drops." If a class is closed, students may change sections on their own, but a new signature is required to change courses.

The *Academic Advising Office*, located in the administration building, helps with problems faculty advisors cannot resolve, places students on probation or suspension, processes petitions for exceptions to requirements and requests to declare or change majors, provides general academic counseling, and attempts to schedule "progress-assessment" appointments with first semester freshmen. Advisors ordinarily see students by appointment or on a walk-in basis. However, at the beginning of the semester, when Academic Advising is busiest, all students are seen only on a walk-in basis. They must sign in, indicate their business, and wait to be called. Students are ordinarily called in the order they have signed in, but those with simple needs are sometimes seen first.

The *Financial Aid Office*, located in a third building, administers student aid and handles work-study assignments. About half of students receive financial aid. Students who apply for federal aid must submit an elaborate Financial Aid Form to an office in another state, which determines their eligibility — sometimes only after requests for supplemental information. The Financial Aid Office then makes aid awards. Ordinarily, notices of awards are issued before a semester begins. However, delays do occur, and students may not receive the notices until after arrival on campus. Students must file a new application for each year, providing evidence of adequate academic progress. During most of the semester, Financial Aid staff see students, either by appointment or on a walk-in basis, during specified "counseling hours." But at the beginning of the fall semester, counselors are available for extended hours to see students on a walk-in basis only. Students must sign in and indicate the reason for their visit. Waits can be up to three hours because problems are being resolved and work study assignments made.

The Office of Residence Life handles room assignments and administration of meal plans for students who live on campus. It also handles requests for repairs or alterations to rooms. Students who wish to live in residence halls complete an application before arriving on campus or

during the preceding semester and are assigned rooms in order of application. Residence Life conducts business at two offices, both in the same dormitory. Waits are usually short.

Other Offices. Students pick up financial aid checks and pay bills at the Cashier's Office in the Administration Building. They must present a validated ID and proceed to color-coded stations to pick up aid checks, sign checks, pay tuition and fees, and receive receipts. Long lines form at the beginning of the semester. The ID Center is located in an upstairs office in the Student Center. Existing ID's can be validated and ID's issued to new students only with proof of registration. Students with campus jobs must also present a social security card and other identification and have their completion of a federal I-9 form witnessed at the ID Center. Lines can be very long, but processing usually goes quickly and waits do not usually exceed 30 minutes.

The complex campus bureaucracy presents many potential problems for students. Some afflict bureaucratic clients generally, while others are specific to this particular setting. There are waiting lines, multiple forms to complete, impersonal processing, complicated rules. As clients, students are relatively powerless. Because offices are highly specialized, staff members may not know the details of procedures and requirements in other offices, and no one has overall responsibility for a given student's affairs. When things go wrong, it is the student who must try to coordinate the efforts of the offices and persuade staff to act. Moreover, offices that perform related functions are geographically dispersed, so staff in different offices cannot easily meet to resolve issues. Students with problems that involve several offices must go from office to office and try to communicate the results of discussions in one office to staff in another. This arrangement is conducive to communications problems that require multiple trips to different offices to resolve. Finally, many of the campus bureaucracy's procedures are long-linked technologies, so breakdowns at one step can produce a domino effect of problems later. For example, if Financial Aid sends confirmation of students' aid awards to the Cashier late, students may subsequently find their registrations canceled by the Registrar, their room contracts revoked by Housing, and their meal plans canceled by the Dining Service.

Existing theory and research suggested that traditional-age freshmen would encounter at least some problems with the campus bureaucracy and that how they defined their situation and the problems it presented would be key to understanding how they coped. However, it leaves many questions unanswered. What specific aspects of the campus bureaucracy are most and least troubling to freshmen? How do they define their experiences? What coping mechanisms do they use to deal

with any frustrations caused by bureaucratic dysfunctions and their relative powerlessness? What strategies do they develop to gather information and gain their objectives? How do they relate to the staff, who may have different perceptions, needs, and goals than students? When does a working consensus that lets interaction proceed develop, and under what conditions do relations between freshmen and staff become conflictual or break down?

Data Collection and Analysis

We tailored our approach to data collection and analysis to the level of development of past literature and our research goals. Many past studies suggest that bureaucracy frequently poses problems for clients, whom it usually places at a considerable power disadvantage. The literature also identifies specific problems clients have commonly encountered in specific settings, though it gives little attention to college students as clients. Symbolic interaction theory emphasizes the importance of actors' definitions of a situation and suggested general processes by which clients develop such definitions of and strategies for coping with new or problematic settings, but it gives relatively little attention to clients in a bureaucracy. Scattered studies suggest mechanisms that clients sometimes use to manage their relationships with bureaucracies, but none look at college students as clients.

Our research strategy used a combination of nonparticipant observation and semistructured interviews to both ascertain the extent to which patterns found in previous studies recur among college freshmen and to allow the discovery of new concepts and patterns to build a grounded theory [12]. We attempted to determine whether insights from past formal theory — such as Merton's work on the dysfunctions of bureaucratic rules — and existing substantive theories about the dynamics of bureaucracy in particular settings — such as Susser's [42] insight that excessive paperwork requirements are often used to punish recalcitrant welfare clients — appeared in this setting by mapping our observational and interview data into these categories. However, we were careful to avoid forcing our data into these categories so that new categories and relationships could emerge from the data [12]. This approach, a modification of the constant comparative method [12] allowed us to discover, for example, that many freshmen did not feel especially burdened by what we might have coded as rigid rules because the rules were so institutionalized as to blend into the background of "just how it is," but that, in this setting, a pattern of events freshmen referred to as "the runaround" was a special burden.

Ten days of intensive nonparticipant observation was conducted in the offices described above and in related campus settings in the fall semester, from the beginning of freshman orientation through the end of the "add/drop" period. Observation was most intensive during the first few days, when most students on campus were freshmen. The first author, then a graduate student, attended freshman orientation sessions and circulated among the offices described above, where he waited in line and sat in waiting areas. He attempted to visit offices at peak times but limited his stay in any area to 30 minutes — less if there was little activity. He also ate in the dining hall and spent time in the student center. To avoid influencing events, he minimized interaction with other students, speaking only if addressed. He recorded observations as they were made. (Writing in a notebook is not unusual on campus.) He encountered no evidence of suspicion from students, who usually leave a site immediately after completing their business. On three occasions, he showed a letter explaining the project to staff who questioned his presence.

Field notes were typed daily, and both researchers reviewed them. We noted (a) observations relevant to topics of theoretical importance identified by the literature review and (b) observations that were part of other unanticipated but recurrent patterns of interest (such as students' tendency to try to understand a situation by watching what went on rather than by asking questions). We discussed these unanticipated patterns as they appeared and began to seek further examples of them to understand their place in the larger picture.

The bulk of our data came from semistructured interviews conducted early in the spring semester with a systematic sample of freshmen drawn from the student directory. The directory, which lists all students enrolled after fall registration, was ideal for our purposes because freshmen who were still enrolled at the time of our interviews had just completed their second registration cycle but still had relatively little experience on campus. After eliminating students who had dropped out of school, were older than 20, or had been on campus more than two semesters, 33 eligible subjects remained. We obtained interviews with 20, 19 of whom lived on campus. Sixty-five percent were female, about the same as among all traditional-age freshmen. The semistructured interview schedule contained questions derived from the literature review and our observations. To avoid forcing data into preexisting categories, we included questions that asked about students' early and most memorable experiences in the four offices without specific guidance about what they should cover. Follow-up questions focused on more specific topics that the literature review and observational analysis suggested

might be important. These included rules, paperwork, waiting, relations with staff, "runarounds," complaining, and coping strategies — and experience in other organizations. Interviews averaged 30 to 45 minutes in length.

Interviews were tape-recorded, and transcripts were typed using Ethnograph, a qualitative data analysis program that allows attaching one or more codes to relevant passages in the interview transcripts. With this program, all segments of the notes linked to any code or combination of codes can be recalled and displayed for use in data analysis. We derived the initial codes we used from the literature review and field observations. However, a careful review of pretest and early interview transcripts by both investigators led to some modifications of the original coding scheme to reflect emergent categories and relationships in the data.

Staff interviewees were chosen from individuals who had worked in the four offices for over a year and whom the directors described as having frequent, direct student contact. In one office, the director selected 5 employees for interviews. The other three directors provided us with lists totaling 21 staff members; we selected 5 at random from each office. All staff members selected agreed to participate. The interviews, which averaged about an hour in length, were also based on a semi-structured interview schedule. They focused on relationships with students and colleagues, causes of students' problems, students' adaptation to the bureaucracy, and staff perceptions of their offices' effectiveness and problems. To encourage frankness, we did not tape-record the interviews. Transcripts were compiled from detailed notes and coded and analyzed as described above.

Several drafts of each segment of our analysis were written by the first author and reviewed by the second — who also read a sample of interview transcripts — for clarity, mutual exclusiveness of categories, and fit between the raw data and the categories and relationships suggested. Issues raised by this procedure were resolved by an iterative process in which our discussions of drafts were followed by further review of the raw data and revised drafts of the manuscript. In later drafts we paid special attention to how the categories and relationships we found constituted an overall pattern that could help to answer our original research question.

Points of Friction in the Campus Bureaucracy

Students did sometimes experience their encounters with the campus bureaucracy as annoying, frustrating, and confusing. However, their re-

actions were mediated by both their relative powerlessness and their interpretations of their experiences and options. Their comments about their problems with the bureaucracy centered around five major themes, lines and waiting, impersonality, rules, "the runaround," and paperwork.

Lines and Waiting

When we asked freshmen open-ended questions about what they remembered about the campus offices, lines and waiting were the most frequently mentioned source of frustration. Freshmen reported waits from 5 minutes to 3 hours. The longest occurred in offices where appointments were not accepted and individualized processing, such as making financial aid awards rather than mass production, was required [50].

Even though freshmen often complained about lines and waiting, not all interpreted waiting the same way. For example, a wait of 30 minutes was defined as "just horrible" by one student, but as "no big deal" by another. Three factors helped to predict how negatively freshmen's viewed waiting. When processing was *visible*, as at registration, students could usually see that the staff was moving as fast as possible, making the students more tolerant. Where processing occurred in private offices, as in Financial Aid, the process was opaque, arousing more frustration and anxiety. As one interviewee said, "It may have been that there was someone in every single office and four people in front of me, but that still doesn't account for an hour and a half." The *predictability* of waits was also salient. Lines where people moved at a relatively steady pace allowed students to estimate how long they would have to wait. Two freshmen even reported counting the number of people in front of them. Sign up sheets produced more frustration because position in the queue was hard to determine in a crowded waiting room. Students could try to estimate their wait by checking the sign-up sheet, but they were sometimes misled, because the order in which students were seen depended partly on the nature of their business. Nor was asking staff about probable waiting times effective. Several staff members reported that they lacked the information to answer such questions. Unpredictability led students to become irritated with situations that they saw as chaotic. Less often, *favorable treatment* affected how students defined waits. For example, one freshman enrolled at the last minute because her program was canceled at another college. Although her application was filed late, Financial Aid agreed to process it. She described a 30-minute wait to register as "horrible" but a similar wait in Financial Aid as "kind of annoying" but understandable because of the office's workload.

But despite the inconvenience, our observations showed that students invariably at least outwardly accepted the lines — even when the waits were long. The interview data provided considerable insight into how and why this happened. First, many students saw lines as normal. As one put it, "I just did it and followed the rest of the sheep." Indeed, the observational data showed that students entering a setting often actually looked for lines and sometimes asked others where the line formed. Freshmen also explained that they saw lines as a legitimate, fair way to order an otherwise ambiguous situation. Observation showed that lines were governed by informal equity norms. Students could leave the line briefly to visit the restroom or recover a forgotten item and reclaim their places. On the other hand, they sometimes complained when staff brought someone to the front of the line, violating the equity the line created. But so long as the norms were followed, lines were usually accepted even when they proved frustrating. In one instructive instance, an interviewee cut a class to get to the add/drop period early to avoid being closed out of a class. When the person in line just ahead of her took the last vacancy, she, even though frustrated, did not complain, because she believed the queue was fair.

Some freshmen said that they didn't mind waiting much; however, for others, overt acceptance of long lines masked stronger feelings. One said simply, "I hated it; I just hated it." Lines could also exacerbate anxiety created by uncertainty about other problems in the bureaucracy: "[I would sit there], hoping that [my problem with the office] would eventually work out and never knowing when it would work out." Nevertheless, only three students, two of whom were already frustrated by lost paperwork, reported becoming really angry about waiting. Only two students expressed anger overtly to staff, and they too accepted the wait in the end. Eight of 20 staff interviewees said that students never complain about lines, and 3 reported minimal complaining. Given the large number of students, this also suggests that complaints are infrequent. In short, freshmen accepted waiting, even when they found it frustrating. As one said, "Waiting is just something you have to go through."

Staff Impersonality

Campus offices pursue efficiency and fairness by basing decisions on regulations, not personal considerations. When asked about their own approach to students, 14 of the 20 staff interviewees said that they tried to remain detached, though 6 added that this did not mean callous indifference. Staff explained their impersonal approach by noting that there are too many students to allow staff to cater to individual needs,

that students need to learn to deal with bureaucracy on their own, not be babied by staff, and that for staff to become personally involved would undermine their effectiveness.

Some freshmen praised staff members who went out of their way to help by telling them where to go for assistance, helping them choose courses or majors, and providing personal attention. Nevertheless, the majority perceived staff's approach as impersonal. One freshman said, "They just did what they had to do and didn't have . . . too much contact with students." Others said that students were treated simply as cases to be processed. One remarked, "I felt like I was being herded, actually, . . . like one of the masses, a number maybe." Another viewed this impersonality as a striking contrast to earlier experiences: "When you go through life, you're a person. People care about you. Then [when] you go to college, it's like a totally new world." Two students interpreted impersonal treatment as indicating that the staff member was having a bad day, and a few complained that staff were rude. Still others felt that staff didn't care about them: "They just want to get you in there and get you out so they can go on to the next person, and they could care less about what you have to get done." Interestingly, students had fewer such complaints about student assistants. They felt that shared experiences linked them to student staff, who understood their problems.

Yet despite these negative feelings, freshmen once again defined an irritating situation as "just the way it is," often ruefully repeating some of the staff's own rationales for impersonal treatment. One said, "I guess in situations like that they can't treat everyone personally. . . . It's got to be 'get it done' or the line will back up a lot longer." Freshmen's desire to complete their own tasks expeditiously inclined them to accept the impersonal treatment, which they saw as necessary to reach their goals. One freshmen explained that he accepted impersonal treatment in the Academic Advising office because, "If they did sit down with everyone, . . . you would be there probably three [or] four hours waiting." Ironically, their acceptance of bureaucratic impersonality meant that freshmen rarely asked for help, making it impossible for staff to work personally with those who needed special assistance.

Rules

The literature suggests that excessive, rigid, and contradictory rules are among the most frustrating aspects of bureaucracy, and the campus bureaucracy manifests an extensive, complicated set of rules. Some staff interviewees claimed that the rules were flexible and that they sometimes made exceptions. Staff did sometimes make exceptions, but

the observational data also revealed many instances of strict application of rules. For example, although staff sometimes suggested alternative signers to students having trouble obtaining required signatures on their advising cards, they invariably insisted on an authorized signature, even when the change was minor. In interviews, some staff members explained that they purposefully granted exceptions sparingly, made students work to get exceptions, and warned students that further exceptions would not be given because they did not want students to think the rules were unimportant. Making too many exceptions might cause problems later if word spread and other students expected the same treatment. Several staff members also argued that the students who had the most trouble with the rules were typically too egocentric to understand that the rules were intended to be fair to everyone. Staff believed that the rules were generally fair and efficient, and they tried to communicate the importance they placed on following rules to students.

Despite the prevalence of formalized procedures, when we asked freshmen about rules, we found that they were of two minds. On the one hand, there was considerable equanimity toward rules. This evidently occurred in part because rules were so much a part of the bureaucratic landscape that many students gave them little thought. Indeed, when asked how they felt about rules and procedures, some interviewees needed examples to clarify the question. One explained, "When I went in, I really wasn't conscious of the rules and procedures. . . . I really didn't think about there being rules and procedures. I just went in." Another carried this theme to the extreme, reporting, "There weren't any rules." Indeed, some students used the word "rule" *only* to refer to regulations that caused them trouble.

When asked directly about rules, most freshmen said that they saw them as necessary to keep things organized. One student whose classes were canceled because of the strict application of a rule about payment due dates nevertheless concluded, "[Without the rules], everything would have gotten all screwed up worse." Several also noted that rules helped them to make sense of a new and unfamiliar environment. As one pointed out, "I didn't have a problem with the [existence of] rules because I didn't know what was to be expected." Most also believed that the rules worked to help them reach their goals. One reasoned, I think [the rules] were necessary . . . because [the university is] offering me the chance to earn money to get an education . . . [therefore] I think its necessary that I take care of everything.

On the other hand, some freshmen, usually those who had been inconvenienced, did have complaints about rules. The requirement that

faculty advisors sign registration schedules often proved especially irritating. Advisors could be hard to find, occasionally signed cards without really providing any help — sometimes without even looking at them — and had to be sought out anew for each schedule change. The rule that assigned the lowest registration priority to freshmen was another source of frustration, because it meant that freshmen encountered many closed courses. "They say you're supposed to graduate in four years, and you can't because you want to take a class that's filled up, but then you can't take that class, so you have to keep going back to different classes." There were also complaints about ambiguous or conflicting rules. As one freshman said, "No one seems to have the same story about what to do about anything." Another characterized rules as intimidating. For a brand new person, the [rules and procedures] are not very straightforward. . . . I felt that it was very confusing, and that just scares you even more. . . . It was very nerve-racking." Finally, there were complaints about inflexible rules and bureaucratic personalities. One freshman criticized a clerk who told her that office procedures meant that a check sent in by the student's mother could not be matched to her paperwork. Cancellation of her registration would probably result. She said that the staff member declined to take an interest in the problem, claiming that nothing could be done.

But in even these instances, our interviewees grudgingly followed the rules, and no one asked for an exception. In part this was because freshmen were not aware of the existence of exceptions or of procedures for obtaining one; in part it was because freshmen tended to perceive rules as immutable and to define their own difficulties as idiosyncratic or as minor hassles. Finally, even freshmen with major problems usually concluded that obeying rules was the best way to reach their goals.

"The Runaround"

Specialized offices scattered across various buildings caused problems for students, who frequently had to visit several offices, often in a specific sequence, to complete their business. Worse still, it was not always clear which office handled a problem. For example, several students were surprised that an office named Academic Advising could not sign class registration cards. As a result, some students found themselves rushing from office to office, sometimes revisiting the same office several times, to solve a problem. Office specialization also contributed to chain reaction foul-ups. For example, two students found that when their financial aid applications failed to go through on time,

registrations and meal plans were canceled. Similarly, paperwork lost by one office could not be forwarded to others, resulting in problems down the line.

Five of 20 freshmen reported serious problems with such "runarounds," and 10 others mentioned minor difficulties. Several complained that they had to make repeated visits to faculty advisors for minor schedule changes. Another complained bitterly about problems finding information about what courses could be substituted for a particular requirement. I've gone there . . . for something, and they've chased me all around the world. . . . They sent me everywhere except where I was supposed to be." One victim of a chain reaction foul-up commented, "I was kind of starting to get angry that people were sending me all over campus to figure out something that they had originally screwed up." Others simply found trying to make all the required stops confusing and frustrating: "I've got to get here. I've go to get there. Your mind's one step ahead of your body."

Other students had trouble understanding that secretaries or receptionists did not have the skill or authority to help with many of their problems. After a receptionist asked one student we observed if she could help, but then took his name and told him to have a seat, he commented to another student, "Isn't it stupid how she asks if she can help you and then tells you to sit down? She'll do it every time. Watch."

Staff members said that they tried to avoid giving students the runaround, but some acknowledged that office specialization and the limited authority of individual officials could produce problems anyway. Two even noted that it is easy for the staff to forget that students have difficulty understanding how the bureaucracy is set up. On the other hand, some staff responses contained hints of victim-blaming [40]. Staff were more likely to blame freshmen's problems on failure to read the rules and acquaint themselves with the system and overreliance on help from parents and friends than on the system itself.

Although victims of major "runarounds" sometimes complained bitterly, most freshmen viewed their experiences as — at worst — mildly annoying. Many resolved their problems fairly quickly. But even those who were seriously inconvenienced rarely directed their complaints to staff. Instead, they chose to accede to the bureaucracy, albeit sometimes reluctantly. They saw the problems with the system as, "just the way it is."

Paperwork

Excessive, redundant paperwork is legendary in bureaucracy; however, the majority of our interviewees found paperwork to be — at most — somewhat annoying. One said, "[The paperwork] was a little tire-

some, but I thought it was necessary. . . . It made sense." In fact, students often received more help with paperwork than with other aspects of the campus bureaucracy. Parents usually filled out the most complicated and problematic form, the Financial Aid Form, and staff were available to help with other paperwork. In addition, freshmen generally defined paperwork as a means to their goals: registration and financial aid. One freshman's reaction to the required I-9 (citizenship verification) form was typical. "It didn't bother me. It's required; if I didn't fill it out, I didn't get my paycheck. And if I didn't get my paycheck, I wouldn't be here."

Nevertheless, paperwork did cause problems for some. Lost paperwork and inaccurate records, in particular, caused consternation. One freshman reported recurrent difficulty with her scholarship check.

> They send me a card in the mail saying . . . your scholarship check has come in and you need to come in and sign your check on this day between these times, and I'll go. And your name is supposed to be on a little colored card. My name — never fails — is never on a card. And yet they send me this thing that says . . . come get your check. So I have to get out my ID, and they have to fill out a card for me. So I stand around and wait for that. Then I'll go up and they can't find my file. They don't understand what kind of scholarship I got.

Others complained about redundant requests for information.

> There's way too much repetition of information. They send you nine to ten forms to fill out the very same information. It's like they lost it the first eight times. I'll be happy to tell you anything you want to know, but don't ask for the same information again and again and again. It gets old.

Another occasional complaint was that required paperwork was not clear or that staff were poorly informed and unwilling to help.

> I ask them the question, and they said to me, "Well if you'd read the form, you'd find your answer in the form." And I said, "Well I read the form. . . ." And they read it and said, "Oh." And it wasn't in the form.

Freshmen were especially likely to become angry when they defined paperwork as pointless. One became frustrated when told that, although it would probably not be possible for him to change roommates, he should complete the forms requesting the change anyway. He complained, "It just seemed like a lot of red tape crap that you had to just do for no apparent reason." Another, recalling problems with complex financial aid requirements, complained bitterly, "It must have been 20 pages of paperwork for $100 [more financial aid]." Yet even students who found paperwork frustrating or pointless almost always yielded to the requirements without overt complaint.

Staff members displayed ambivalence about paperwork. Most acknowledged that paperwork, especially the dreaded Financial Aid Form, was a problem for some students, and some agreed that forms could be redundant, lack complete instructions, or implicitly assume too much knowledge. A few complained that paperwork requirements interfered with meeting students' needs. Nevertheless, many staff also insisted that most problems arose because students did not read the instructions, did not ask for assistance, and relied too heavily on parents.

Student Acquiescence to the Campus Bureaucracy

The literature suggested that freshmen might have trouble adapting to the campus bureaucracy, and our interviews showed that many found the bureaucracy annoying at times, while a few experienced considerable frustration. Nevertheless, both the interviews and observational data showed that students rarely displayed *overt* anger about lines, closed courses, paperwork, and runarounds, suggesting that most elected to deal with the campus bureaucracy without verbal complaint, confrontation, or formal appeals. Staff members also reported relatively little complaining and arguing, especially from freshmen, explaining that new students were timid, uncertain, and afraid; however, several noted that freshmen's body language could betray suppressed frustration and anger. Students generally expressed anger overtly only in extreme cases. For example, one victim of an extended runaround later experienced further consternation when he wanted to give a financial aid check directly to a receptionist. She insisted that he give her a personal check instead, as the financial aid award was not yet in the computer system. Although he became angry with her and argued vociferously, he too ultimately gave in and followed the required procedure.

Freshmen's explanations of how they viewed the bureaucratic requirements and their own situation provide considerable insight into their acquiescence. They identified five interrelated reasons for accepting the campus bureaucracy.

One major reason for the lack of overt complaining and confrontation was that freshmen almost always interpreted the campus bureaucracy as the natural order of things. The bureaucracy was so well institutionalized that most had difficulty imagining options — even when an outsider might conclude that alternatives, such as adding more staff to speed up processing, were available. Thus, one student explained, "I just didn't know how they could do anything better than they were"; another commented, "I was upset that it happened, but there was

nothing that any of them could really do." Long lines, frustrating rules and the like were seen as beyond anyone's control, and the few freshmen who suggested improvements often qualified their ideas by saying that they really didn't know whether they would work better. Even those who experienced serious problems sometimes emphasized bureaucracy's strong points, viewing their difficulties as isolated and defining the bureaucracy as generally effective. A few also blamed themselves for their problems, acknowledging that they had not read or followed the procedures.

This definition of the situation led students to accept the bureaucracy — at least grudgingly. As one put it, "That's the way it's supposed to be; that's the way it's going to be." Another said, "That's just part of the rules and regulations. Got to do it; can't cry about it." Consequently, even when bureaucratic requirements and procedures caused them annoyance and frustration, freshmen usually acceded to them. One victim of an extended wait explained his feelings this way, "At that point, I had to stand in line. . . . I didn't really have a choice. I mean, I was hungry. I wanted to go to lunch, but I didn't have a choice, so I just stood there."

Second, freshmen reported that past experiences, such as waiting in a doctor's office, paid jobs, and working in high-school student government, helped them to understand and adjust to the campus bureaucracy. Most also mentioned high school itself as preparation, including — somewhat surprisingly — two who believed that high school had been even more bureaucratic than the university. More typical were those who said that high-school bureaucracy was similar, but on a smaller scale. "[High school] was a taste, so when I came here, it really wasn't anything different. . . . I wasn't really as surprised as I think I would have been if I hadn't had some previous experience." However, some had little experience at all with bureaucracy. Four students, all of whom found adapting to the university bureaucracy difficult, indicated that high school had been much less bureaucratic, offering attentive, supportive assistance.

Third, freshmen interviewees said that they lacked information needed to challenge the system. Knowledge is an important basis for power in organizations [37], and freshmen, as newcomers, had not had enough experience in the campus bureaucracy to understand it very well. As one explained, "I was a freshman; I didn't realize what the hell I was supposed to be doing." Sometimes, ironically, there was even too much information, that is, too much new information to comprehend at once. As one freshman noted, "I didn't know what to expect, so I didn't know how to take it all in." Lacking a clear picture of how things

worked, freshmen found it difficult to question the established order, and the limited information they had predisposed them to do things the organization way. For example, lack of knowledge of the existence of exceptions or, even more often, procedures for obtaining one predisposed freshmen simply to accept the general procedures established for everyone.

Fourth, interviewees' accepted the campus bureaucracy because they believed they had little power. Some believed that it was inappropriate for newcomers at the bottom of the hierarchy to challenge the system. One said simply, "I just don't feel like it's my place [to argue]." They allowed their behavior to be guided by staff, even when they disagreed or did not understand, because they respected authority and expected staff to be in charge. One freshman explained, "[When a receptionist] tells you to sit down, that's what you do." In addition, most freshmen concluded that they were potentially at the mercy of campus bureaucrats. With their superior knowledge of the rules and their ability to enforce them rigorously if they chose, staff could make students' lives more difficult or help them to reach their goals. Thus, 13 of 20 staff interviewees said that they sometimes overlooked minor rule violations — a practice that gave them considerable leverage. Students concluded that it was safer to accept instructions from staff than to risk offending them by complaining. Two freshmen reported that they even "made up" majors on the spot to satisfy a staff member's insistent demand that they list one. Another said that if she complained, "maybe they wouldn't help me as much as they would if I were calm." A few also said they feared that failure to comply might earn them the label of troublemakers, a supposition that also received some support from staff interviews.

This is not to say that the exercise of staff power involved much overt conflict. Staff usually exercised power politely and prudently, and their superior knowledge made it easy for them to persuade students to do things the organization way — in the process socializing them into the bureaucracy [25, 34]. They simply offered polite advice about what students needed to do, presenting their suggestions as in students' best interest. The widespread reliance on lines, rules, and procedures also reduced the need for staff to issue direct orders, and they rarely gave them. Like rules, staff power blended into the background, and even staff themselves seemed almost unconscious of it.

When students violated their expectations, staff often found indirect ways to get them to conform. The observational data showed that students who forged to the front of a line saying that they had only a quick question were simply ignored. It was also obvious that staff members used informal but fairly rigid "scripts" to structure interaction, espe-

cially when many students had to be processed quickly. If a student rambled on or took too much time, staff members displayed enough impatience to bring him or her back into line.

As a result, although freshmen sometimes resented being at the bottom of the totem pole, they usually did not feel that they were being ordered around. Students generally complied with staff requests and suggestions, allowing staff to control their behavior almost without fully realizing it. One freshman explained her compliance with a staff member's request for an appointment this way:

> The lady called me and made an appointment with me, which I think is a bit more pressing than my making an appointment with her . . . [so] it's important for me to get my tail over there and do stuff. I mean . . . she's calling me and doing [things for me].

The final and most immediate reason for freshmen's compliance was that they almost invariably concluded that cooperating with the bureaucracy was the best approach to reaching goals that were important to them. As one freshman explained, "I basically realized that there was no choice. If I wanted to take classes this semester, . . . I had to do what it takes, so I did." For most students, cooperating with the bureaucracy and accepting what they defined as just minor annoyances without complaint led simply and directly to meeting their objectives. So it is not surprising that they elected to cooperate. But even freshmen who had experienced serious problems were apt to adopt this outlook. For them, the bureaucracy "worked" only in the limited sense that, after considerable frustration, they finally did achieve their goals. Nevertheless, the circumstances that persuaded other students that working with the system was the best course also elicited compliance from them, albeit with a more negative view of the bureaucracy and occasional overt protest. As one said, "I don't see another . . . way to solve the problem, so I guess I'll have to deal with it [their way]."

Coping with Campus Bureaucracy

Freshmen usually accepted the campus bureaucracy as "just the way things are," elected to cooperate with it, and rarely challenged it overtly. Yet their compliance was often somewhat grudging, and at times they were irritated and frustrated by their powerlessness and the campus bureaucracy's requirements and dysfunctions. Hence, they had to develop strategies for coping with the problems the bureaucracy caused them. By ameliorating the problems the students face, these coping strategies help the bureaucracy to maintain itself and function despite its drawbacks.

Finding Out How the Bureaucracy Works

As newcomers, freshmen need information about which offices to consult for various services, what materials or information to bring, and the order in which events must occur. Several staff people noted that freshmen are bombarded with so much confusing information that they have trouble determining what is important or understanding any of what they have been told. Students also often cited lack of good information as a key reason for many of their problems with the campus bureaucracy. They mentioned confusing instruction sheets, inadequate orientation sessions, and staff who assumed that freshmen understood everything in advance. As one said, "They acted like I was supposed to know all this stuff, and I don't know where the hell I was supposed to find out about it."

Our interviewees adopted various strategies to sort things out and decide what they should do. Some adopted a "watch and learn" strategy. From what they saw, they inferred how they should interact with staff, what paperwork was needed, and what procedures were in use. For example, students were observed leaving the ID Center after they saw that others had brought receipts from the Cashier's Office, commenting that they were going to get their receipts. In some offices, ropes that guided lines and signs on the walls also provided information. Several freshmen said that they purposefully observed what occurred in the campus offices to gain information, but for many "watch and learn" was not a systematically planned strategy. Instead, their need for information made them ready to note and absorb whatever data crossed their paths. Several staff members and students pointed out that students preferred to learn by watching rather than by asking questions because they did not know what to ask and wanted to avoid appearing naive or bothering staff.

Freshmen sometimes did ask directly for information or advice from staff as well as from friends or parents, who sometimes accompanied them. Students accompanied by friends and parents were a common sight during our observations, but most freshmen reported that they did not rely heavily on them for advice. Most of the freshmen's friends were also freshmen, and interviewees told us that neither they nor parents had much useful information. Staff tended to emphasize the help students received from friends or parents more than the freshmen, usually citing instances of bad advice.

Strategies for Getting What You Want

The campus bureaucracy and students' relative powerlessness could make reaching their objectives frustrating. It was therefore to their ad-

vantage to find ways to "get around" the bureaucracy to get what they wanted more directly than they could by going thorough official channels. If successful, use of unsanctioned or unofficial methods to reach their goals has the potential to defuse tensions that might otherwise build up in interacting with the campus bureaucracy.

One obvious strategy for achieving one's ends is to violate the rules, but most freshmen interviewees said they never did so. The requirement that the faculty advisor sign the registration card is a good example. The requirement could be aggravating, and the opportunity for rule violation was obvious. Many freshmen said they knew that others had forged a signature, and the chance of being caught was low. Yet only four students said that they had considered forgery, and only two had done so. Staff also noted that a few students failed to follow the requirement to inform Financial Aid when they dropped below a full course load, but they said this violation was rare, and none of our interviewees mentioned it.

Freshmen gave several reasons for hewing to the rules. A few said that they were afraid of being caught. Others believed that following rules was fairly easy, so breaking them was not worth it. Some said that they did not yet know the system well enough to guess what they could get by with but might break more rules later. Many seemed to take rules so much for granted that breaking them was almost unthinkable. Thus one labeled the advisor's signature rule as "written in stone."

Fibbing is another potentially effective way to shortcut the bureaucratic process and reach one's goals. Staff interviewees reported occasional instances of students who lied about what other staff members had told them. Some of these "lies" may actually have been the result of student misunderstandings of what other staff had told them, and none of our student interviewees reported lying.

Another possible strategy is to enlist the help of parents. Both observational data and freshmen interviews indicated that parents accompanied students fairly often, especially to Financial Aid, where they could provide needed information. Nevertheless, only two instances of parents intervening directly were noted in the observations, and only the two student interviewees who experienced the worst problems said they had asked their parents to help. Nevertheless, the mere presence of parents may have helped to ensure more responsive treatment. One freshman explained,

> "I think the way they treated me was different when my mom was there and when my mom wasn't there. It's like, 'Well, here's your daughter; we're going to treat her good; everything is going to be fine.' Then whoa! Mom's gone, and it's like, 'Now we're going to treat you like we really want to treat you.'"

Usually however, the bureaucracy worked well enough that students preferred to handle things themselves. And indeed, some parents insisted that they do so.

Staff members had a different view of parental intervention; 19 of 20 reported that students sometimes brought parents along, and 17 said that parents were very active in assisting students, helping them with paperwork, interceding when dorm repairs were not completed promptly or when mistakes in processing paperwork occurred, and even helping students to select courses. Several commented about parents who insisted on doing all the talking, often to the student's embarrassment. But staff also reported instances in which students asked parents to accompany them because they believed this would help to get what they wanted. Freshmen may have underreported parents' assistance because it threatened their self-esteem, and staff's strong negative reaction to parents' involvement may have led them selectively to remember times when parents intervened. Staff have good reason to dislike parental intervention. Dealing with parents takes time, creates conflict between trying to satisfy the parent and avoiding unfair exceptions, and may affect job performance ratings or job security. Perhaps partly for these reasons, most staff believe that students should handle their own affairs.

Filing complaints and appeals is another strategy for getting one's way in bureaucracy [25]. The campus bureaucracy offers several ways for students to appeal decisions, through the offices themselves, to faculty committees, or through the administration. Although our interviewees did not know the details of these procedures, most were aware that complaints were an option. Some had actively considered mounting a formal complaint, but no one had actually done so, and staff reported that formal complaints were rare. When we asked students who had encountered problems why they did not complain, some said that they had just never been pushed far enough. Others claimed that complaining was not in their nature: "I guess I'm not that kind of person, to really go and complain about things." Others were afraid that appeals would succeed only in offending powerful staff members.

Despite the irritation and frustration — and occasional genuine anger — that dealing with the bureaucracy could engender, both the observational and interview data indicate that students generally chose to be nonconfrontational. This could require using "fronts" [13] to conceal true feelings. Through speech, gestures, and manner, they presented a calm, rational outward demeanor, even when inwardly angry. They often tried to appear "mature" and cooperative and conform to the norms of the bureaucracy. Our freshmen interviewees believed that such fronts were the best way to maintain superficially pleasant relations with staff, make a favorable impression, and reach their goals. By

acting this way, students contributed to the development of a "working consensus" [13], supporting staff's view that the bureaucracy worked relatively smoothly.

Most direct encounters with staff did not last long, so it was not too hard for students to maintain their "performances." Nevertheless, some did lapse, at least momentarily. For example, one student was observed to become overtly hostile when a staff member asked her if her papers had been checked. Rather than respond to the anger, the staff member ignored it, and the student soon resumed her calm "performance." Staff members believed that it was important to maintain calm outward appearances and to avoid dealing with obviously angry students, therefore they usually did not react to such lapses or to student body language that signaled frustration or anger.

Dealing with Frustration

Whatever their strategies, students did not always get what they wanted immediately and they sometimes had to put up with considerable inconvenience before they reached their objectives. Hence, they needed to find ways to deal with the resulting frustration. By reducing or managing frustration, these safety valve strategies made it easier for students to maintain smooth relations with the campus bureaucracy.

A few freshmen tried to reduce their frustration with the campus bureaucracy by simple avoidance. One explained, "I haven't dropped or added a class just because I didn't want to have to go through the crap. It just seemed like too much of an ordeal." For most, however, avoidance was not feasible. They had to find other ways to reduce or manage frustration.

One approach was to create psychological distance. Students sometimes responded to staff impersonality by viewing staff just as impersonally as the staff viewed them. If staff members were affectively distant, our interviewees would transform them into just another part of the bureaucratic apparatus, expressing only partly concealed resentment by referring to them as "Miss Whatever" or "the poor little lady." Or as another put it, "A receptionist is a receptionist is a receptionist." By creating interpersonal distance, students could avoid damage to their self-esteem by deciding that staff opinions of them did not matter and justify expressing resentment toward staff.

Another set of strategies for reducing frustration centered around waiting in line. Both observation and interview data indicate that students in lines spent much time talking to one another, allowing them to build social networks and pass the time. Indeed, 5 of our 20 interviewees actually recruited friends to go with them to a campus office. As one said, "It would have been a lot worse if I hadn't had someone to wait

with me." Others were accompanied by parents for the same reason. Some freshmen reported using waiting time to conduct "symbolic rehearsals" [41] of upcoming interaction with staff. Others passed the time and reduced their anxiety by tracking their progress: "I just watched the line in front of me and noticed how much time each person was taking and tried to evaluate how much longer until I would be seen."

Because freshmen were unwilling to vent their frustration to staff, they turned elsewhere to express their feelings. The ends of lines, for example, provided "back regions" where students could "come out of character" [13] and voice their complaints to other students. When staff members were near, these complaints were suppressed or muted in the interest of avoiding friction with staff. Friends, roommates, and parents could also provide a sympathetic ear for students needing to blow off steam.

Staff Coping Behaviors

Staff members too experienced difficulties trying to make the system work and managing their sometimes conflictual relationships with students. Staff dealt with conflict primarily by attempting to maintain a businesslike attitude when dealing with students. By emphasizing following the rules, making clear that they expected to be treated respectfully, and maintaining emotional distance between themselves and students, staff could insulate themselves from the emotional demands of their work while reassuring themselves that they were providing fast, equitable service [25, 30]. All staff members said that they tried to avoid conducting business with visibly angry or agitated students. They tried to calm them, encouraged them to leave the office, and referred the most problematic cases to supervisors. Similarly, decisions about student petitions were made in private. Students were informed by mail, protecting staff from the immediate anger of students whose petitions were denied. Strategies like these reduced the emotional strain on staff, helping to stabilize the system.

Staff also developed shared interpretations of why students had difficulties — some of them self-serving ones that protected their self-images and commitment to the system. Although some did concede that runarounds and confusing jargon caused some problems for students, staff attributed most problems to students who looked for short cuts, put things off, accepted poor advice from parents and friends, and — most of all — failed to read and follow rules. Staff reported that students who were too dependent on parents, those from small towns, and freshmen had the most difficulty. They characterized freshmen as lost, "green," and too accustomed to having their parents take care of things.

Staff also sometimes engaged in "victim-blaming" [25, 40]. For ex-

ample, we heard uncooperative students described as having "attitude problems," parents characterized as "domineering," and students who advised others as merely "thinking that they know what's going on." Although probably true in some instances, staff's ready reliance on such characterizations reassures them that the system is sound and that most problems come from uncooperative individuals.

Like students who were irritated by the bureaucracy, staff who were frustrated by aggressive students or difficult decisions turned to peers for counsel and support. Backstage conversations allowed them to vent frustrations, make light of student peccadillos, reassure one another of the soundness of the procedures, and obtain advice about how to handle problematic cases. Several noted that conversations with colleagues let them "talk out" their frustration with students who had angered them rather than directing the anger back toward students.

Implications

Bureaucracy is the dominant organizational form in our society, and learning to adapt to it is an important aspect of socialization. College freshmen's first experiences with bureaucracy are theoretically and practically strategic because, as putative adults, freshmen must learn to deal with bureaucracy and its problems without the protection and support of parents and sympathetic teachers. They must define a new situation, adapt to bureaucratic constraints, and learn to operate successfully in a bureaucratic context. Because their encounters are early ones, freshmen's experiences reveal the dynamics of adapting to bureaucracy especially well. They may also set the pattern for later encounters, helping us to understand how bureaucracy perpetuates itself despite built-in strains.

Bureaucracy uses specialization, rules, hierarchical authority, records, and impersonal decision making to achieve efficiency, accuracy, and speed by tightly structuring behavior, minimizing wasted effort, and encouraging rationality [47]. Yet bureaucracy carries a price, especially for lower participants. Bureaucratic dysfunctions, such as runarounds, waiting in line, and communication breakdowns, are not just obstacles to efficiency. They are also sources of irritation and frustration for clients. Moreover, because bureaucracy works by tightly controlling behavior, lower participants sometimes find working within its confines annoying and unpleasant [2, 46].

Bureaucracy thus presents a paradox for clients seeking services. Like most social structures [7, 8], bureaucracies have a positive side, meeting needs in an orderly way, and a conflictual side, controlling client behavior in ways that impose costs. As newcomers to bureau-

cracy, freshmen confront this paradox immediately. The bureaucracy often operates predictably, equitably, and relatively efficiently to meet their needs [20]. When it does, it elicits trust and compliance [3]. But to get bureaucracy to meet their needs, students must pay a price, subordinating personal preferences to the bureaucracy's demands, standing in lines, accepting impersonal treatment, filling out required paperwork, following rules, and accepting staff guidance. Control does not come merely from having to take orders [8], but also from a complex apparatus of rules, physical barriers, records, indirect cues about proper behavior, and rewards for conformity and punishments for deviance [10, 25]. Adapting to these constraints can be unpleasant, so motivating clients to conform can be problematic [24].

Yet freshmen do in fact usually conform, even when inconvenienced or frustrated. The forces that produce their compliance form a complex, interactive system, which is especially persuasive for newcomers. Socialization teaches them to define bureaucracy as the normal and best way to accomplish complex tasks. For many, successful encounters with bureaucracy reinforce this view [20]. Freshmen often lack the previous experience or knowledge needed to visualize arrangements that might work better, and they do not see challenging the system as appropriate behavior for neophytes in a subordinate role. They see staff members as having authority, and they fear that challenging the system might cause staff to retaliate by withholding the information or help they need [3]. Although they may acknowledge minor flaws in the bureaucracy, staff are generally committed to the system that employs them and puts them in control of interaction. They communicate this commitment and their expectations to students, and they withhold cooperation from those who do not conform.

Faced with these conditions, it is very likely that most clients, especially organizational newcomers like college freshmen, will define bureaucracy as part of the natural order of things and as relatively efficient, viewing any problems they encounter as minor irritants or isolated incidents. The minority who encounter more serious difficulties often have more reservations and complaints about the bureaucracy, providing greater potential for conflict [24]. But these clients interpret and act on their experiences within the context of a larger group who define the bureaucracy as normal and efficient. Almost all respond by concluding that it is to their advantage to conform overtly to bureaucracy's demands, maintaining a compliant, cooperative front in their brief interactions with staff. They see conformity as a more promising path to their goals than protest. Staff members encourage and reward this behavior, and staff's willingness to make exceptions and overlook

minor rule violations helps to defuse some of the most serious conflicts. Freshmen who experience problems reduce their own anxiety and frustration by gathering information about how the bureaucracy works, by developing strategies to manipulate the system to get what they want, by blowing off steam in backstage settings, by seeking emotional support from family and friends, and by developing strategies for reducing frustration.

The result is a bureaucratic system that continues to elicit acceptance and cooperation from lower participants whom it sometimes does not serve well. Complaints are repressed or expressed only in muted terms. Freshmen fit their actions to bureaucratic constraints, and behavior flows through well-worn bureaucratic channels, even when they and staff define things differently [48]. So long as both groups follow bureaucratic procedures, the organization can continue to function.

As today's freshmen evolve into tomorrow's seniors, they often become more accustomed to the system, more adept at working within in, and a bit more willing to bend rules or complain. Nevertheless the definitions of situation and patterns of behavior laid down early persist at the university and are probably carried to new organizations — just as experiences from high school and early job experiences help to shape the definitions and behavior of freshmen.

The reactions of students who differ in age, gender, class, or regional background might depart in detail from our findings, but the pattern of conformity and acceptance reported here is apparent on many other campuses, as well as in other client- serving bureaucracies [25], and it outlived the student revolts of the 1960s and 1970s. Examination of its roots helps us to understand how bureaucracy endures despite tensions inherent in it, both on the university campus and beyond.

References

1. Argyris, C. "Selections from the Impact of Budgets on People." In *Organizations: Structure and Behavior,* edited by J. A. Litterer, pp. 251–263. New York: Wiley, 1952.
2. Argyris, C. *Personality and Organization.* New York: Harper, 1957.
3. Bidwell, C. E. "Students and Schools: Some Observations on Client Trust in Client-Serving Organizations." In *Organizations and Clients: Essays in the Sociology of Service,* edited by W. R. Rosengren and M. Lefton, pp. 37–69. Columbus, OH: Bobbs-Merrill, 1970.
4. Blau, P. M. *The Dynamics of Bureaucracy.* Chicago: University of Chicago, 1955.
5. Blumer, H. "Society as Symbolic Interaction." In *Symbolic Interaction: A Reader in Social Psychology,* edited by J. Manis and B. Meltzer, pp. 145–153. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

6. Braverman, H. *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century.* New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975.
7. Dahrendorf, R. "Out of Utopia: Toward a Reorientation of Sociological Analysis." *American Journal of Sociology*, 64 (September 1958), 115–127.
8. Dahrendorf, R. *Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1959.
9. Downs, A. *Inside Bureaucracy.* Boston: Little, Brown, 1966.
10. Edwards, R. *Contested Terrain.* New York: Basic Books, 1979.
11. Etzioni, A. *A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations.* New York: Free Press, 1975.
12. Glaser, B. G., and A. L. Strauss. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory.* Chicago: Aldine, 1967
13. Goffman, E. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1959.
14. Goffman, E. "The Interaction Order." *American Sociological Review*, 48 (February 1983), 1–17.
15. Gracey, H. "Learning the Student Role: Kindergarten as Academic Boot Camp." In *Readings in Introductory Sociology*, edited by D. Wrong and H. Gracey, pp. 347–361. New York: Macmillan, 1972.
16. Gulick, L. H. "Notes on the Theory of Organization." In *Classics of Public Administration*, edited by J. Shafritz and A. Hyde, pp. 80–89. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1992.
17. Hall, R. H. *Organizations: Structures, Processes, and Outcomes.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1991.
18. Homans, G. C. *Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974.
19. Jackson, P. W. *Life in Classrooms.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.
20. Katz, D., B. A. Gutek, R. L. Kahn, and E. Barton. *Bureaucratic Encounters: A Pilot Study in the Evaluation of Government Services.* Ann Arbor, MI: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, 1975.
21. Lauer, R. H. *Social Psychology.* Boston: Houghton Miflin, 1977.
22. Lawler, E. E. III, and J. G. Rhodes. *Information and Control in Organizations.* Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear, 1976.
23. Lawrence, P. R., and J. W. Lorsch. *Organization and Environment.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967
24. Lefton, M. "Client Characteristics and Structural Outcomes: Toward Specification of Linkages." In *Organizations and Clients: Essays in the Sociology of Service*, edited by W. R. Rosengren and M. Lefton, pp. 17–36. Columbus, OH: Bobbs-Merrill, 1970.
25. Lipsky, M. *Street-level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1980.
26. Mann, L. "Queue Culture: The Waiting Line as a Social System." *American Journal of Sociology*, 75 (November 1969), 340–354.
27. March, J. G., and H. A. Simon. *Organizations.* New York: John Wiley, 1958.

28. Mechanic, D. "Sources of Power of Lower Participants in Complex Organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 7 (December 1962), 349–364
29. Merton, R. K. "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality." In *Social Theory and Social Structure*, by R. K. Merton, pp. 249–261. New York: Free Press, 1968.
30. Milgram, S., H. J. Liberty, R. Toledo, and J. Wackenhut. "Response to Intrusion into Waiting Lines." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51 (1986), 683–689.
31. Miller, D. C., and W. H. Form. *Industrial Sociology: Work in Organizational Life*. New York: Harper and Row, 1980.
32. Mintzberg, H. *The Structuring of Organizations: A Synthesis of the Research*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1979.
33. Pascarella, E. T., and P. T. Terenzini. *How College Affects Students: Insights from Twenty Years of Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992.
34. Parelius, R. J., and A. P. Parelius. *The Sociology of Education*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1987.
35. Perrow, C. *Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman, 1986.
36. Perrow, C. "A Framework for the Analysis of Organizations." *American Sociological Review*, 32 (April, 1967), 194–208.
37. Pfeffer, J. *Power in Organizations*. London: Pitman Publishing, 1981.
38. Presthus, R. *The Organizational Society*. New York: St. Martin's, 1978.
39. Rosengren, W. R. "The Social Economics of Membership." In *Organizations and Clients: Essays in the Sociology of Service*, edited by W. R. Rosengren and M. Lefton, pp. 205–222. Columbus, OH: Bobbs-Merrill, 1970.
40. Ryan, W. *Blaming the Victim*. New York: Vintage Books, 1976.
41. Stryker, S. *Symbolic Interactionism*. Menlo Park, CA: Benjamin/Cummings, 1980.
42. Susser, I. *Norman Street*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
43. Thomas, W. I. "The Definition of the Situation," In *Symbolic Interaction: A Reader in Social Psychology*, edited by J. Manis and B. Meltzer, pp. 331–336. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.
44. Thompson, V. A. *Modern Organizations*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.
45. Van Maanen J. "Organizational Socialization." In *Handbook of Work Organization and Society*, edited by R. Dubin, pp. 67–130. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.
46. Vaughan, T. R., and G. Sjoberg. "The Individual and the Bureaucracy: An Alternative Median Interpretation." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 20 (January 1984) 57–69.
47. Weber, M. 1946. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.
48. Weik, K. *The Social Psychology of Organizing*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1979.
49. Wilensky, H. *Organizational Intelligence*. New York: Basic Books, 1967.
50. Woodward, J. *Industrial Organization: Theory and Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Allyson Fiona Hadwin
Philip H. Winne

Study Strategies Have Meager Support

A Review with Recommendations for Implementation

Introduction

Study skills instruction in higher education has become increasingly popular in the past decade. Many universities and colleges have developed short courses to teach study skills, established learning resource centers, instituted counseling programs, and offered workshops focusing on study skills. An increasingly common venue embeds study skills instruction within a full-semester formal course, "University 101," that aims to ease high-school students' transition to university life.

It is not coincidental that study skills are receiving increased attention in postsecondary education. Whereas universities and colleges once rigorously screened and selectively admitted candidates, they now face a need to balance the costs of sustaining quality teaching in the face of major budget cuts and potentially reduced enrollments (McKeachie, 1988). Students now pay a larger proportion of direct costs for their postsecondary education, and in turn they are justified in holding universities and colleges accountable for services they purchase. Furthermore, as institutions orient toward serving mature stu-

This article is based on a paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education in June 1995. Thanks to Michelle K. McGinn and John R. Kirby for providing feedback on earlier drafts of this article. Support for this research was provided by grants to P. H. Winne from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (No.410-92-0239, No. 410-95-1046). Correspondence should be addressed to A. F. Hadwin or P. H. Winne, Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, V5A 1S6. E-mail may be posted to allysonh@sfu.ca or winne@sfu.ca.

Allyson Fiona Hadwin is a graduate student in education, and Philip H. Winne is a professor of education at Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada, V5A 1S6.

Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 67, No. 6 (November/December 1996)
Copyright 1996 by the Ohio State University Press

dents who have been away from school for a number of years and students who are challenged in their pursuits of higher learning, there are increased needs to support students as they strive to cope with the academic demands of higher education.

In this climate, we suggest that higher education should not merely teach students knowledge in curricular subjects such as history, chemistry, and sociology. Institutions also should provide means for students to develop adaptable strategies with which to pursue knowledge and solve problems during and after postsecondary experiences. Having such skills contributes abilities and the motivation necessary for lifelong learning.

Early Investigations of Studying

In the late 1970s and early 1980s researchers began to probe how postsecondary students studied and to explore factors that correlated with more effective approaches to studying. In innovative articles, Biggs (1978), Dahlgren and Marton (1978), Ramsden and Entwistle (1981) surveyed students and correlated their reports about how they studied with measures of achievement; personality factors, such as locus of control; and various situational variables, such as college major, attributes of how course grades were assigned, and workload. A theme these studies shared was that a particular form of cognitive engagement, called deep processing, correlated with more vigorous and apparently effective studying. Deep processing is a collection of separable studying tactics that articulate basic cognitive operations to build meaningful and coherent structures of knowledge. Specific tactics that lead to deep processing include retrieving related concepts and ideas relevant to material currently being studied, monitoring relationships between new information and prior knowledge, assembling propositions into elaborated structures, rehearsing and transforming information into meaningful schemata, and metacognitively monitoring and adapting learning tactics according to the requirements of a task (Winne, 1985).

Paralleling such surveys of students' studying were a growing number of proposals that students be taught studying methods that could support deeper processing of course materials. Perhaps the most well known of these is Robinson's (1946) SQ3R — survey an assignment, generate questions, read, recite answers to questions, and review answers in relation to the text. Such apparently useful approaches to studying were widely proposed, but these suggestions were unfounded. Summarizing research prior to 1980, Johns and McNamara (1980, p. 1) concluded that "support for SQ3R is based more on opinion than on empirical fact." Our search of the literature since this review was pub-

lished found just four empirical investigations (Chastain & Thurber, 1989; Graham, 1982; McCormick & Cooper, 1991; Schumaker, 1982). Only one (Chastain & Thurber, 1989) demonstrated that students taught SQ3R achieved more or better quality learning, but according to criteria we apply later to select studies that can validly address this issue, this study's conclusions are suspect. In short, there is *very* meager evidence for the merit of study methods such as SQ3R.

Newer Perspectives on Studying Strategies: More than Just Methods

McKeachie (1988) suggested that the term strategy denotes skill in a repertoire of learning methods that are selectively applied to complete tasks under particular conditions. He highlighted important features of strategies, noting that they are neither mere methods for achieving goals nor just a collection of such methods. Strategies involve deliberation and planning (Winne, 1995). For example, underlining select phrases in a text is not a strategy. To be strategic, a student must (a) have alternatives from which to choose, (b) deliberate about the advantages and disadvantages of each relative to the task at hand, and (c) select underlining because it is judged to be more effective for meeting goals than its alternatives. Following Mayer (1988, p. 11), who suggested that "learning strategies are behaviors that are intended to manipulate a person's cognitive processes during learning," we reserve the term *strategy* to refer to occasions when students define their own short-term (local) goals and overall (global) goals for studying and select and coordinate alternative study tactics they expect will be helpful in achieving those goals. When students additionally monitor their studying and adapt tactics as they observe the contribution each makes to learning, they are self-regulating (Winne, 1995).

We posit that informed self-regulation of studying tactics is central to learning effectively. Self-regulating learners set goals, develop and adapt diverse methods to strive toward those goals, are motivationally engaged in this process, and are metacognitively aware about their learning decisions, processes, and the products those processes create (Butler & Winne, 1995; Winne, 1995; Winne & Perry, 1994). We propose that it is the element of *intent* to manipulate one's cognitive processes that distinguishes self-regulating from "merely using" a study tactic. Such intent is a key feature of students' knowledge about the conditions under which it is plausible and productive to apply studying tactics (Winne & Perry, 1994).

Under this view, we suggest that effective study strategy workshops, courses, and programs must have two kinds of goals. First, they should

aim to teach students primary tactics for deeply processing information. Second, students need to learn more than just a collection of individual tactics; they also need to learn how to be strategic in choosing, adapting, and implementing those tactics in concert (Butler & Winne, 1995). We hypothesize that, if study skills programs teach students rigid sequences for addressing specific studying tasks, students are neither being taught about nor encouraged to adopt, develop, and adapt tactics that can meet diverse needs arising in different tasks and settings. Consequently, transfer to other domains suffers, and the objective to equip students, both cognitively and motivationally, for lifelong learning will not be met.

The Review

In this article, we review contemporary empirical studies that investigated study tactics and strategies in postsecondary settings. We sought to identify learning tactics that have been empirically demonstrated to be effective, thereby providing resources for designing courses and other forms of support for postsecondary students. Studies we examine also supported students, at least minimally, or provided opportunities for self-regulating study tactics, that is, creating strategic approaches to studying. This stands in contrast to prescribing tactics for students to learn and use under rigid laboratory conditions. Our tools for analyzing this body of research are contemporary theories of self-regulated learning and cognitive processing.

Jenkins (1979) suggested that a full description of a learning episode involves four facets: the learner's characteristics, characteristics of the task, learning activities, and criterial or outcome tasks that are used to assess the extent and quality of learning. Jointly, these four facets characterize a context that we suggest must be attended to when seeking generalizations from research. To Jenkin's four facets, we add a fifth that is logically essential and empirically powerful in academically effective self-regulation — feedback. Self-regulating students depend on feedback to update perceptions about a learning context (Butler & Winne, 1995; McGinn & Winne, 1994) and to choose tactics that strategically promote learning. While well-controlled "laboratory" studies are essential for advancing and testing theories of learning, they purposively trim sources of variance from these five facets that constitute the real-life context of learning in postsecondary education. Therefore, to examine the effects of study tactics in a more ecologically relevant, though admittedly an experimentally less rigorous context, we exclude from our review studies in which strategy instruction or evaluation of students' achievement was not related to a course that students were

taking for a grade. We believe this choice allows investigating "what works" simultaneously with questions about what students will use.

In this review, we address four primary questions:

1. What study tactics are effective and thus have potential to be included in interventions designed to promote students' learning strategies?
2. How were study tactics taught and strategies promoted?
3. In what context did interventions succeed?
4. Toward what short-term or local goals were study tactics directed?

After examining answers to these questions provided by recent research, we suggest guidelines for further researching the development of knowledge about strategic studying.

Methods

A preliminary literature search was conducted to develop criteria for selecting studies to include in this review. Computer searches of ERIC and Psychological Abstracts databases were conducted for articles published in English language journals between 1989 and 1995 using the following search key: any of the index terms study habits, time management, notetaking, reading comprehension, learning strategy/ies crossed with any of the index terms higher education, high school, secondary education, college, undergraduate. This search returned 315 articles from ERIC and 283 articles from Psychological Abstracts. Interestingly, only 32 items appeared in both searches, resulting in a total of 566 unique items. Issues of journals in this list that were printed since the databases had last been updated could not be hand-searched, because the vast majority of them were unavailable in geographically close university libraries.

In this review we apply a variant of best-evidence synthesis (Slavin, 1986). Best-evidence procedures guide the selection of studies to be reviewed by identifying what is germane to the issue being investigated and testing studies to assure they meet stringent criteria for internal and external validity. In accord with best-evidence procedures, we applied the following criteria to this list of 566 articles to select studies to be reviewed.

1. *Sample.* We focused on nondisabled, postsecondary students. Some evidence suggests that the strategies successfully employed by postsecondary students vary considerably from those used by students in high school (Matt, Pechersky, & Cervantes, 1991), which may help to explain difficulties first-year students encounter in their adjustment

to the university. In accord with our concern about the context of learning, this raises a caution flag about generalizing findings from study skills research that involves high-school students to a postsecondary population.

2. *Students used a study tactic or strategy versus merely receiving information.* Students participating in the study had to apply a study tactic themselves or be taught about a tactic that they later used solo. If the treatment only provided materials that students "just" read (e.g., advance organizers, outlines of lectures), or the article did not explicitly describe that students used study tactics solo, the study was excluded.

Applying criteria 1 and 2 reduced the sample of 566 articles to 52,[1] a mere 9.2% of the initial pool.

3. *Traces of using studying tactics.* We retained studies only if they reported data that explicitly verified students had engaged in a study tactic or strategy. For example, if students were told to underline selectively while studying their text book, but the article mentioned no evidence that students complied with this injunction, we eliminated that study. In contrast, if students' reading materials were collected and scored for the presence (and/or types) of underlining, we included that study in our review. Five categories of studies can be classified in these terms:

a. No data were collected to verify that students' applied a study tactic.
b. Students reported that they used a tactic, but there was no independent verification of this claim.
c. Information about a comparison or control group made it clear that students in an experimental group had applied a study tactic.
d. Each student in an experimental or strategies condition(s) was observed by an experimenter (or assistant) to determine whether they applied a study tactic.
e. The extent to which (e.g., frequency of occurrence, number of notes) or quality of students' use of a study tactic was scored from materials students used while studying.

We judged that studies provided valid evidence about learning strategies and study skills only if they met criteria c, d, or e. If an article did not include information upon which to classify it into one of these categories, it was excluded. Applying these filters further reduced the sample of 52 articles to 33, 5.8% of the initial pool.

4. *Task relevance.* Tasks within which students applied study tactics and learning strategies had to be representative of those typically assigned at the postsecondary level. For example, chapters and articles from textbooks and journals were considered relevant, whereas a small

number of unrelated, brief paragraphs or high-school texts were not. This criterion insured that the tasks students performed represented authentic postsecondary work. Applying this criterion reduced the remaining 33 articles to a sample of 21, 3.7% of the initial pool.

Next, we applied one of two criteria to identify two kinds of articles in our final selection.

5a. *Syllabus focus.* Researchers' descriptions were examined to determine whether the subject matter (e.g., transportation systems) students studied was part of the syllabus for a course (e.g., Canada since Confederation). If it was, we included the study. If the subject matter was irrelevant to the course syllabus (e.g., The Birth of Stars was used merely as a content vehicle in a general study skills course), the study failed this criterion of syllabus focus. This criterion for selecting studies operationalizes one aspect of the context in which study tactics and strategies are used, namely, that using the study tactic(s) had consequence for students in relation to marks on papers or tests that contribute to a course grade.

5b. *Tactic focus.* Applying the preceding criterion of syllabus focus would reject studies in which students were enrolled in a grade-bearing study skills course and where competence in applying a study tactic was directly related to their grade in the study skills course. These conditions also satisfy our interest to examine studies in which students use study tactics in a context that has consequence. So, we included articles that described students as enrolled in a study skills (or similarly intended) course and where students were marked for their competence in applying study skills to postsecondary tasks. Unlike studies meeting the criterion of syllabus focus, studies that met the criterion of strategy focus involved students applying study tactics to content that was merely a vehicle for demonstrating competence in study tactics.

Applying the first four criteria plus criterion 5a reduced the remaining pool to 7 articles, 1.2% of the initial pool. Using the first four criteria plus criterion 5b, an additional 9 articles were identified, constituting 1.6% of the initial pool.

Six articles were randomly selected from the pool of 52 articles and rated against criteria 3, 4, and 5 by the second author. We achieved 90% agreement.

A broader search (1980–1995) of the literature also was conducted to identify studies relating to several common study methods — notetaking, underlining, and larger study methods such as SQ3R (and its variants) — and published studies about "learning to learn" courses. After reviewing these articles, we chose to limit our review to studies reported since 1989 for two reasons. First, a review of the notetaking, un-

derlining, and SQ3R research prior to 1989 revealed that these studies reported findings similar to those in our restricted set. Moreover, because we sought to review studies in terms of theories of self-regulation, information provided by the earlier studies made a limited contribution to this purpose because they were couched in ways that were difficult to relate to the newer work on self-regulated learning. Second, classifying articles according to our five selection criteria could not be reliably implemented using terms allowable for searching the literature databases. We lacked resources to review the enormous list of earlier studies that would need to be screened to identify those meeting our criteria. We note that in the studies we did identify there were few citations to prior studies. Finally, regarding "learning to learn" courses, we found no published evaluations of such courses (e.g., C. E. Weinstein's course at the University of Texas) that met our criteria for inclusion.

The number of studies available for review, as we structured it, is very small. Hence, caution must prevail in considering our interpretations and inferences. Furthermore, we note explicitly that our evaluations are based on information provided in the articles. If researchers' descriptions were vague or if they neglected to include methodological information upon which we could make classifications, studies may have been categorized inappropriately. Noting these limitations, what answers do these 16 studies provide to our four questions?

Results for Syllabus Focused Articles

Which Study Tactics Have Been Empirically Supported?

These seven studies tested just three learning methods: concept mapping, self-questioning, and time spent studying.

Concept mapping. Concept mapping is a procedure whereby students create a visual representation of information they study. In some versions of concept mapping, the result is a flow chart. Predominantly, however, concept maps are networks of information nodes and links among the nodes. Links are sometimes labeled according to their types, for example, cause-of, example-of, necessary-condition-for, and so on.

Four studies evaluated concept mapping. In Briscoe and LaMaster's (1991) study, biology students were divided into high- and low-achieving groups, though grades or other indicators of achievement were not reported. These researchers then examined qualities of six students' concept maps and students' perceptions about concept mapping. Low achievers produced more linear maps, whereas high achievers produced maps of a more complex structure. Students also provided self-reports

that supplement this objective finding. All of them claimed that concept mapping helped them to identify concepts they should link with others, even when they were unable to articulate the nature of those links. The students also reported being better at recognizing what they did not know and remedying that gap. These students judged that concept mapping helped them organize information but claimed it was useful for other courses only when the types of questions tested in those courses required "a lot of thinking" versus memorization. Students who were insecure about their knowledge in the course had difficulty making maps at all.

Bernard and Naidu's (1992) study also supports concept mapping as a study tactic for postsecondary students, but the value of the tactic was contingent upon students' persistence. Four groups were compared: post-questions with feedback, post-questions without feedback, both concept mapping and post-questions with feedback, and concept mapping with feedback. The post-questioning groups were given questions to answer at the end of each class. One of these groups received feedback on their answers while the second did not (the control). Students who received both concept mapping and post-questions received post-questions with feedback after classes in the first half of the term, then made concept maps for the remainder of the term. In a context where students had the option of using concept mapping after some instruction about how to do it, the concept mapping group was further divided into two groups: those who completed eight or more concept maps over the remainder of the course were distinguished from those who completed less than eight maps.

Bernard and Naidu (1992) reported results relevant to select hypotheses rather than all possible comparisons. Two findings relate to the midterm examination. For essay items, students who made eight or more concept maps recorded more of the ideas they had mapped than students who were given study questions without feedback had recorded in answers to those questions. Also, students who made eight or more concept maps scored lowest on multiple-choice items compared to the other four groups.

Three findings relate to the final examination. Students who had made eight or more concept maps had more elaborate and accurate essays than students in the two groups who had been asked to answer questions after each class. Also, students who had made eight or more concept maps had more accurate essays than those who had made fewer than eight concept maps. Finally, the group who had received questions with feedback after the first half of their classes and then made concept maps for the remainder of the course outperformed students who had

received post-class questions without feedback. From the select set of hypotheses that the researchers tested, we conclude that making concept maps for most of the course helped students answer essay questions at the end of the course. However, performance on multiple-choice measures may be depressed at midterm, though this dampening effect does not carry over to the final examination.

Mixed findings about the effectiveness of concept mapping versus using one's own learning tactics were reported by Heinze-Fry and Novak (1990). Students were administered a multiple-choice test as a pre- and posttest. They also participated in an interview session in which they first wrote all they knew about each of several topics. The pre- and posttests and interviews were conducted immediately after the third unit and again five months later. This material then could be consulted when students orally elaborated "all they knew" about that topic and when they generated oral justifications for their answers to application questions.

Heinze-Fry and Novak did not find any statistically detectable results but reported several "tendencies." Scores on the multiple-choice posttest and interviews tended to be higher for the mapping group. They also found that this gap increased on a delayed posttest administered five months later. On other measures, however — specifically, knowledge application and knowledge synthesis questions on one unit, and multiple-choice and interview items generally — there were no differences between the concept-mapping and control groups. In support of concept mapping, Heinze-Fry and Novak reported that, compared to students in the mapping condition, students in the control condition made more errors on initial (immediately after completing the third unit) and posttest interviews (five months later), and made fewer links among concepts in their descriptions of the curriculum. Students who used concept mapping reported that it affected their learning style by increasing integration, organization, understanding, and retention, while it did not affect their tendency to memorize. They also reported having to study less for the final examination and that concept mapping helped more in the long run than the short run. Impressively, 42% of concept mappers reported that they used this study tactic in courses they took the following semester.

The effectiveness of concept mapping was also evaluated by McCagg and Dansereau (1991) in two content domains within a psychology course — physiology and statistics. Students were assigned to make concept maps for either the physiology or the statistics unit. For the physiology chapter, students who made concept maps performed better than students who did not make concept maps on a multiple-choice test

and on essays. No differences were detected for the statistics chapter, however. The positive effects of concept mapping for the physiology chapter were durable, lasting over two testing periods, and robust across two types of measures. There was a minimal amount of diffusion of the concept mapping tactic to the chapter where students were not assigned to use it.

On the basis of these four studies, we tentatively conclude that concept mapping is a potentially effective tactic. We are tentative because these results suggest that the context within which students study can affect the effectiveness and the utility of concept mapping. Three qualifications can be suggested. First, concept mapping is useful if courses require "deep thinking" rather than memorization for retaining facts. Second, the benefits of concept mapping are more pronounced for students who persist in using the tactic. Third, students with low content knowledge may feel insecure about concept mapping.

Self-questioning. This study tactic was popularized by Robinson's SQ3R method. It consists of drawing on prior knowledge, with or without a scan of the material to be studied or the assignment to be completed, to generate questions about what is to be learned or done in an assignment.

Two studies provided mixed reports about the effectiveness of students generating questions to answer. King (1989) found that self-questioning improved comprehension for students learning from text but had no impact on their sense of agency. In contrast, Foos (1989) compared two groups of students, one of which generated essay questions while the other generated multiple-choice questions. He observed no differences in the groups' performances on tests. When he classified whether students' questions called for knowledge, application, interpretation, analysis, or evaluation of lecture content, he found no difference in question quality between the two self-questioning groups. This result seems to be due to the fact that students assigned to write essay self-questions often wrote questions that called for specific facts rather than conceptual manipulation.

Time spent studying. In Dickinson and O'Connell's (1990) study, students were required to record the dates and times they studied, compute their study time for each study session and each week, and classify each studying session as one primarily devoted to reading, reviewing, or organizing. Presumably, recording one's time spent studying and accounting for the types of study activities provides a basis for generating periodic self-feedback about studying. Students who reported more time spent studying received higher course grades, but we cannot determine whether this reflects students' monitoring of the type of study

tactics they used or the actual time spent studying. Dickinson and O'Connell (1990) indicated that students' reports of time spent organizing contributed to 18% of the variance in course grades, and students' reports of time spent reviewing and organizing were statistically positively correlated with course grades.

Summary of findings. In the context of regular university courses, the tactics of concept mapping, self-questioning, and time spent studying have some positive empirical support. Because only Heinze-Fry and Novak's (1990) concept-mapping study involved a strategy as we defined it, there is no solid basis for concluding whether study strategies are effective. Overall, because there are very few studies, the basis for recommending any of these three study tactics is limited.

How Have Study Tactics Been Taught?

Formats for teaching study tactics varied considerably across these seven articles in terms of duration; type of and access to feedback; and student independence in learning, selecting, and implementing the tactics.

Briscoe and LaMaster (1991) introduced concept mapping in class as a study technique. They began with a brief discussion about the differences between learning for understanding and learning by rote. Students then worked in a whole-class setting to identify concepts and construct propositions from a text and were given a sample concept map. Next, after reading a short chapter, students made a list of concepts and attempted to map them. This formed the basis for generating a concept map as a whole class, which students later revised as a homework assignment and handed in for feedback. Concept maps continued to be constructed, discussed, and analyzed as part of class activities for the remainder of the term. Students also were permitted to use their concept maps as resources during examinations. While students were required to create concept maps as part of their class activities in biology, some students reported using them in other contexts.

Students in Bernard and Naidu's (1992) study engaged in concept mapping over six classes in a semester. A self-instructional workbook introduced concept mapping in terms of its usefulness and procedure. Students were assigned concept-mapping exercises at the end of each of 12 classes, to be completed independently. Rather than providing individual feedback on students' maps, as Briscoe and LaMaster (1991) did, feedback was provided to the entire class by model concept maps.

The time spent teaching students about concept maps and practicing how to make them was considerably shorter in Heinze-Fry and Novak's (1990) study. Here, students were given handouts that introduced concept mapping, described its characteristics, and provided examples of

good and poor maps. However, students engaged in concept mapping for only one month and were given feedback on only three of their unit maps. These differences in the intensity of instruction and feedback may account for Heinze-Fry and Novak's (1990) weak findings compared to Bernard and Naidu's (1992) study.

McCagg and Dansereau (1991) also gave students a relatively short time to learn concept mapping. Students were exposed to concept maps used as outlines by the course instructor over the first 12 hours of instruction (approximately 4 weeks) under the presumption that students should learn to read and process such displays before attempting to generate their own. In week 5, the instructor led a 15-minute discussion on producing concept maps. Sample concept maps were provided, and students, working in pairs, "read" the maps to each other. Students then were assigned to create a map about alcohol and cocaine over the next week, and a research assistant was available for consultation and feedback. After two 50-minute lectures on the target domains of statistics and physiology, students were assigned to create a map for one of these topics, although they would be marked on the information from both domains. Students were again given one week to complete the assignment, and the research assistant was available if they required assistance or feedback.

The time spent on self-questioning instruction was relatively limited in King's (1989) study. Students participated in three 15-minute instructional sessions in which they used stems to generate questions either independently or in cooperative groups. Feedback on their questions was provided. Students in Foos's (1989) study also received limited instruction on writing either multiple-choice or essay self-questions two weeks before they took tests that were used to assess the effects of self-questioning. The ease with which students in these studies learned to use self-questioning and these studies' positive findings suggest that self-questioning is an easier tactic to learn than concept mapping.

In Dickinson and O'Connell's (1990) study, instructions to students about recording the date, time, duration, and type(s) of studying were minimal.

In What Contexts Did Study Tactics Succeed?

Each of these studies was retained in our sample because it met discriminating criteria for ecological relevance. In particular, these studies engaged students in a task that was characteristic of the postsecondary context, and learning the subject matter with the option to apply a study tactic determined students' grades. We suggest that whether a student

can learn a tactic (e.g., concept mapping) and use it to achieve a superfluous outcome (e.g., to answer essay questions in an experimental lab) will have less generalizability than the studies we review, because such studies intrinsically lack the genuine complexity and latitude students experience in actual university studying. It is precisely that latitude and flexibility that occasions *self-regulated strategic* studying.

Findings from these seven studies suggest that concept mapping, self-questioning, and monitoring time spent studying may be effective in authentic contexts, that is, where students are responsible for both using the study tactic and learning the subject. Subjects were varied, including biology, nursing, elementary education, and topics in psychology. Formats for the criterial tasks in the studies included test items involving application, synthesis, and problem solving in the sciences (Briscoe & LaMaster, 1991; Heinze-Fry & Novak, 1990); knowledge, comprehension, and application in a distance education nursing course (Bernard & Naidu, 1992); and higher-order questions in a course on elementary education (King, 1989). This is a modestly wider spectrum of kinds of criterial tasks than was used in Foos's (1989) study of self-questioning, McCagg and Dansereau's study (1991) of concept mapping in psychology, and Dickinson and O'Connell's study (1990) of time spent studying in a course on learning principles and classroom management.

Results from Studies Where Tactics Were Taught Outside Degree-Related Courses

By changing the selection criterion from syllabus focus (mastery of subject matter studied was the basis for grades in a course) to strategy focus (mastery of a study tactic was the basis for grades in a study skills course), nine more studies met our set of selection criteria. Each of these studies used task relevant materials that postsecondary students might study in typical courses. Eight studies were situated within study skills or developmental reading courses; the ninth was conducted in a regular course where students received extra credit based on their performance while using a study tactic to study information outside the course's regular syllabus. These nine studies investigated various tactics: learning to use graphic organizers, concept mapping, annotating text, self-questioning, a 4-part study tactic called PLAE (preplan, list, activate, evaluate), creating charts, underlining, summarizing, using generative vocabulary techniques, and notetaking. The prevailing objective in each study was to engage students in study tactics that facilitate memory for information.

Which Study Tactics Have Been Empirically Supported?

King (1992) found that self-questioning and summarizing resulted in a higher percentage of ideas appearing in students' lecture notes than did notetaking followed by reviewing notes. These differences corresponded to higher retention and comprehension of lecture material, measured by multiple-choice items, for students who engaged in self-questioning.

Ruddell and Boyle (1989) found that students who made concept maps included more supporting details and cohesive ties in a summary of a text and had higher holistic scores on their summaries. While these students improved compared to initial levels of performance when reading texts with problem-solution or thesis-proof formats, they showed no differences in recognizing main ideas compared to students who did not map. These findings are consistent with Briscoe and LaMaster (1991) in that mapping was useful when the students were reading more difficult material or reading information that required "more thinking."

In a study by Spires (1993) students received explicit instruction about self-questioning plus instruction about two-column note taking. They outperformed a control group, as well as a group taught to take two-column notes without self-questioning, on two measures: notetaking and comprehension (measured by questions about main points and supporting details presented in the study materials).

Dunston and Ridgeway (1990) considered the effectiveness of teacher-constructed or student-constructed graphic organizers for recalling assigned text passages. All students received instruction on identifying and using text structure to organize information within an eight-week study skills course. Students were provided with a college level textbook chapter. Additionally, some students received a researcher-constructed organizer that represented the main ideas and supporting details, and other students added supporting details to a partially complete organizer. A third group of students were given the material to be learned with no accompanying organizing materials. No differences were found between the three groups on a multiple-choice test or free recall task.

Peterson (1992) examined the effectiveness of underlining on achievement measured by multiple-choice fact and inference recognition items. She found that students were more likely to recognize facts and inferences on a test if they had underlined the relevant word or phrase in the text they studied and that most students underlined as they read rather than after reading a section. Because students could recog-

nize facts and inferences that related to specific lines or that bridged a few lines of text, it seems clear they were underlining selectively. But it is not known whether such underlining contributes to understanding the overall meaning of the text.

Frazier (1993) extended the idea of underlining to annotating (or text marking), hypothesizing that this would help students create a resource to use when subsequently studying for examinations. Findings did not support this hypothesis. Frazier found that students tended to annotate too much or too little, resisted annotating as a method to prepare for later studying, and did not use it in any of their other classes. Integrating these findings with Peterson's (1992), it is not surprising that students annotated too much or too little. Assuming that students annotate as they study (as Peterson observed them to do when underlining), they annotate before they construct an overall understanding of the theme in a section or chapter. Hence, information is lacking that is needed to annotate strategically. Consequently, most of the information seems important or little does. In support of our analysis, Frazier (1993) found that students had difficulty distinguishing important from trivial information. Like students who used concept maps in Briscoe and LaMaster's (1991) study, students in Frazier's (1993) study reported that using annotating to study was easier in proportion to their content knowledge, knowledge that provides a basis for discriminating which information is important. And finally, students' statements about the utility of annotating were consistent with their use of the strategy. In other words, students choices to use the annotating strategy were determined by its relationship to their goals in studying text.

Balajthy and Weisberg (1990) examined the effectiveness of a 4-step study method: (a) reading the passage to identify topics and categories of comparisons, (b) identifying and organizing comparisons and contrasts by underlining or annotating, (c) creating a graphic organizer, and (d) incorporating compare-and-contrast information from the text into a summary statement. Students who used this method had better performance on a multiple-choice test and were better at constructing a graphic organizer than students who engaged in other comprehension activities (not described by Balajthy & Weisberg, 1990). As might be expected in light of our previous analysis, students with moderate prior knowledge of the content produced better summaries and had higher comprehension and retention scores than those with low prior knowledge.

Nist and Simpson (1990) compared the effectiveness of a tactic involving preplanning, listing, activating, evaluating (PLAE), and time management. They found that students trained in PLAE performed de-

tectably better over four examinations than students in the time management training group. Students in the PLAE group also improved their abilities to predict their scores on single test items and the total test.

In a subsequent study, Nist, Simpson, Olejnik, and Mealey (1991) taught students specific tactics to support one or more of three goals: (a) learning the meaning of new words through using generative vocabulary strategies such as structural and textual analysis; (b) organizing by using concept cards, maps, self-questioning, charts, and predicting examination questions; and (c) improving executive control through the use of the 4-part PLAE tactic (planning, listing, activating, evaluating). After instruction on this set of tactics, students were free to choose any of these trained tactics or any of their own, self-developed study tactics when studying three chapters. Surprisingly, given earlier findings, students most frequently chose a study tactic that was not instructed in this study, annotating. The least frequently used tactics also were among those not instructed, outlining and rereading. Generally, students engaged in a mean of 3.3 tactics, and the number of tactics they engaged in was inversely proportional to test scores; that is, when fewer tactics were used, test scores increased. However, tactics relying on executive control processes, PLAE in particular, and word meaning were consistently and statistically detectably associated with better test performance.

In What Context Did Study Tactics Succeed?

In the set of earlier reviewed studies that met the criterion of syllabus focus, students made decisions about how to invest effort, in the form of study tactics, as they studied to pursue self-determined goals in their courses. In the set of studies that met the alternative selection criterion of strategy use being relevant to course grades, the opportunity for students to make such decisions is removed. We believe that this is a critical difference in interpreting the results of investigations into the effectiveness and use of study methods, because we define the exercise of choice about which goals to pursue and how to invest effort as defining features of strategic learning. Based on this distinction, we interpret findings from studies where using study tactics was a basis for marks as describing what students can do when they have no direct concern for mastering the content they study. In contrast, studies that met our criterion of being syllabus focused describe how students typically behave strategically in their everyday academic pursuits.

Students in King's (1992), Spires's (1993), Balajthy and Weisberg's (1990), and Frazier's (1993) studies were required to participate in a

learning skills course and were evaluated on their use of tactics in a variety of university-relevant tasks. Participants in Ruddell and Boyle's (1989), Nist and Simpson's (1990) and Dunston and Ridgeway's (1990) studies were volunteers.

In Nist et al.'s (1991) study, students were taught several tactics and were then evaluated on whichever method they chose for the criterial task (learning a history chapter). This acknowledges the role of student decision making, approaching our conditions for studying to be strategic. But we believe that, because the content students studied was not relevant to their marks, this study still falls short of a genuine test of what students do, or will do, to learn in their regular postsecondary courses.

Peterson's (1992) study might be classified into either the syllabus-focused or tactic-focused sets. Students in her study were enrolled in an education course, were required to participate in the experiment on study tactics, and received bonus marks for their education course contingent upon performance on the history material studied in the experiment. We elected to classify it outside the syllabus-focused set because the history material was irrelevant to the syllabus in the education course.

What Local Goals Do Study Tactics Intend To Support?

Conceptually, syllabus-focused and tactic-focused studies did not fall into neat categories of study tactics. Many studies simultaneously considered and compared the effectiveness of several tactics, and researchers' labels for tactics were not standard. Nonetheless, we attempted to organize study tactics according to the local purpose or goal they served, contrasting a local goal, such as marking a segment of text for later restudy, with a global goal, such as learning a chapter well enough to score highly on a test. We suggest that considering study tactics in relation to local goals has three advantages over the common practice of naming a study tactic using terms that describe actions students use to enact the tactic, for example, underline. First, tactics are enacted to approach a goal, and our system makes this explicit. Second, study tactics that produce different physical products (e.g., a map, annotations) can approach the same goal. In studying individual differences in students' learning strategies, it is thus necessary to investigate why students who hold the same local goal choose different tactics. Third, when a particular tactic can support multiple goals, our system explicitly acknowledges that fact. Moreover, if the ultimate objective of study skills instruction is to promote self-regulated learning, so that students are strategic and effective users of study tactics, it seems to us

that students should learn, first, to identify local goals that are served by particular study tactics and, second, to evaluate tactics in terms of their success in achieving those goals.

Drawing on earlier work by one of us (Winne, 1992), supplemented by an analysis of the larger pool of 52 articles in which postsecondary students were taught study tactics, we identified eight categories of local goals (see Table 1). These groupings are admittedly speculative, because none of the studies, except for Nist et al. (1991), *explicitly* linked tactics to goals they might serve.

Only two studies in our sample, Frazier (1993) and Nist et al. (1991), attempted to evaluate the effectiveness of tactics in relation to local goals. Frazier asked students whether they used annotating in their other courses. Not surprisingly, the two students who believed annotating had utility used annotating when studying in other contexts. The other two students, who found little utility in annotating, used it minimally. This supports our premise that study tactics are not uniformly effective, they are vehicles with which students attempt to address various goals.

Nist et al. (1991) taught students tactics that addressed three local goals: organizing, engaging in executive processes (goal setting and planning, monitoring), and focusing on word meaning (which we judge to approximate transforming). These researchers claimed that 25% of the variance in test performance was accounted for when students engaged in tactics to support these three goals. Furthermore, they reported that executive control alone explained 20% of the variance in test performance. By grouping tactics in terms of local goals, Nist et al. ac-

TABLE 1

Eight categories of local goals associated with study tactics.

Goal	Description
Monitoring	Examining qualities of or improvements in work on a task, as well as monitoring one's process (executive processes)
Organizing & Transforming	Reassembling and selecting information, establishing understanding, and enhancing achievements
Goal-Setting & Planning	Identifying goals or subgoals Planning a pattern of acts and setting time limits
Seeking Information	Attempting to secure information relevant to the task at hand, making use of resources and soliciting help
Environmental Structuring	Selecting or arranging the physical setting of studying to enhance learning or focus attention (e.g., external storage)
Self-Consequating	Arranging to receive or imagining rewards for success or penalties for failure
Rehearsing & Memorizing	Practicing; rote reviewing
Reviewing	Reexamining prior work

knowledged that various tactics may be effective for achieving a single goal. We suggest that study skills instruction has yet to build on this notion by teaching students how to decide upon specific learning goals and adapt or adopt study tactics to meet those goals.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Over the last seven years, only 9% of 566 articles published about study skills and learning strategies report any sort of empirical test of these interventions' effects on tasks typically undertaken by postsecondary students. Of these 52 articles, only 16 met our best-evidence criteria that required data on whether students actually engaged in a study tactic or compared students taught a study tactic to other students who studied by whatever methods they might have developed on their own. Moreover, the archived literature contains no comprehensive projects that investigate the effectiveness of study skills courses, either within a single institution or collaboratively, involving multiple institutions. In the light of these facts, we observe irony in urging students to be strategic in examining whether their study methods are effective while the field foregoes that enterprise.

Our review documents that there is a *very* scant research base upon which to ground recommendations for study tactics that populate the many handbooks available (e.g., Pauk, 1991) or to justify mounting costly programs that promise to improve students' study skills. In today's resource-limited world, this is unsound fiscal management. When study skills instruction is embedded in regular postsecondary courses, which we labeled syllabus focused, research provides modest empirical support for teaching students about concept mapping, self-questioning, and monitoring the time spent studying. In studies where tactics were taught outside credit-bearing courses (our category of tactic-focused studies), there is a suggestion that self-questioning again shows positive effects, as do nonstrategic multistep tactics that script students' engagement in studying. Underlining also positively affected learning, but other tactics — graphic organizers, skeletal outlines, and text annotations were not differentially effective.

Practitioners frequently discuss their bewilderment at students who attend study skills and developmental reading courses, learn the tactics, and demonstrate they can use them, then choose not to use them in their courses. We offer as a hypothesis for future research that our distinction between subject-focused and tactic-focused studies may account for oft-heard concerns about the limited transfer of tactics from study skills courses to degree-related postsecondary courses. It may be that a more

effective context for learning those same study tactics is one where students are taking degree-related courses under conditions in which students themselves can determine the utility of those tactics in relation to local goals of their own choosing. Though this speculation has yet to be validated, there is no question that the lack of knowledge about how to foster transfer of effective study skills from one context to another is a significant gap that merits forceful address.

A Few Study Skills Can Be Cautiously Recommended

Having explicitly noted our reservations, we cautiously conclude that concept mapping, self-questioning, and monitoring one's time spent studying seem to have modest positive effects on students' achievement in courses. We speculate this is because each of these study tactics aims to meet one or a few local goals during studying sessions. What has not yet been investigated is how students identify their own local goals during study sessions and how capably they can select from among multiple study tactics to approach local goal(s) they identify. It has also not yet been researched whether students adapt study tactics to differing circumstances that they are likely to encounter among the range of courses they take. These are important targets for future research.

Embed Research Within Study Skills Programs

We urge that study skills programs, however they may be situated in students' curricula, strive to embed research and evaluation into their efforts. If only 10–15% of the study skills courses now being offered started to collect these data, it could make a significant contribution to our understanding of the effects such courses have and the effectiveness of study skills education in general.

Use a Model that Promotes Transfer and Utility

Stahl, Simpson, and Hayes (1992) note that a common goal of study skills instruction is that students are equipped with tools (study tactics) they can use to facilitate learning in various contexts. Our review indicates that, to the contrary, students typically are taught discrete tactics for implicit, singular local goals that are, as often as not, dissociated from their regular courses. We believe this is a recipe for limiting the likelihood students will be prepared to transfer study tactics to contexts in which they must be strategic. We also hold that the ability to transfer effective studying strategies is essential, because even if every course a student takes includes its own study skills component, students must still survive the world of lifelong learning that exists beyond the boundaries of campus.

We offer two additions to Stahl et al.'s recommendation. First, as well as teaching students what is involved in using study tactics, we

propose teaching them about (a) different local goals and (b) alternative tactics that can be used to reach each goal. With a fuller awareness about goals, techniques, and ways to match goals to techniques, we believe students will be better positioned to approach studying strategically. Moreover, such an enriched view of studying establishes a basis for students to engage in "high-road transfer" (Salomon & Perkins, 1989) of study tactics across studying situations so that they can abstract principles about how local goals articulate with study tactics to produce positive effects. By adopting such an approach, we hypothesize that students inherently engage in broader and deeper cognitive processing about their *studying*, as well as about the content they study. Both processes are critical in establishing a fruitful base for students to engage in self-regulation of learning (Winne, 1995).

Second, we suggest blending students' work in their regular courses with instruction about study strategies. To learn and hone study tactics and to develop genuinely adaptive strategies, students must work with some academic content. We hypothesize that using academic content drawn from the courses in which students are enrolled will have more benefit and relevance than separating study methods instruction from a student's current course load. Four reasons underlie this suggestion. First, we hypothesize that students will ascribe greater value to study tactics and strategies that they experience as contributing to grades in their credit-bearing courses. Second, as students acquire and practice analogous study tactics across different content and contexts characteristic of several courses, "natural" variance in context invites them to engage in mindful abstraction that underlies transfer (Salomon & Perkins, 1989). Third, students will be genuinely involved in all three elements of productive self-regulation — framing goals, considering techniques, and strategically selecting and adapting tactics — as they approach studying in an authentic context. Fourth, feedback about the effects of their study methods — from peers, their text, teaching assistants, and lectures — will likely be more frequent and meaningful when study methods are used within the context of day-to-day work in their courses.

Note

[1]Complete references for all 52 articles are available from the authors.

References

Balajthy, E., & Weisberg, W. (1990). Transfer effects of prior knowledge and use of graphic organizers on college developmental readers' summarization and comprehension of expository text. *Yearbook of the National Reading Conference, 39,* 339–345.

Bernard, R. M., & Naidu, S. (1992). Post-questioning, concept mapping and feedback: A distance education field experiment. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 23,* 48–60.

Biggs, J. B. (1978). Individual and group differences in study processes. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 48,* 266–279.

Briscoe, C., & LaMaster, S. U. (1991). Meaningful learning in college biology through concept mapping. *The American Biology Teacher, 53,* 214–219.

Butler, D. L., & Winne, P. H. (1995). Feedback and self-regulated learning: A theoretical synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 65,* 245–281.

Chastain, G., & Thurber, S. (1989). The SQ3R study technique enhances comprehension of an introductory psychology textbook. *Reading Improvement, 26,* 94–96.

Dahlgren, L. O., & Marton, F. (1978). Students' conceptions of subject matter: An aspect of learning and teaching in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 3,* 25–35.

Dickinson, D. J., & O'Connell, D. Q. (1990). Effect of quality and quantity of study on student grades. *Journal of Educational Research, 83,* 227–231.

Dunston, P. J., &. Ridgeway, V. G. (1990). The effect of graphic organizers on learning and remembering information from connected discourse. *Forum for Reading, 22,* 15–23.

Foos, P. W. (1989). Effects of student-written questions on student test performance. *Teaching of Psychology, 16,* 77–78.

Frazier, D. W. (1993). Transfer of college developmental reading students' textmarking strategies. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 25,* 17–41.

Graham, S. (1982). Comparing the SQ3R method with other study techniques for reading improvement. *Reading Improvement, 19,* 45–47.

Heinze-Fry, J. A., & Novak, J. D. (1990). Concept mapping brings long-term movement toward meaningful learning. *Science Education, 74,* 461–472.

Jenkins, J. J. (1979). Four points to remember: A tetrahedral model of memory experiments. In L. S. Cermak & F. I. M. Craik (Eds.). *Levels of processing in human memory* (pp. 429–446). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Johns, J. L., & McNamara, L. P. (1980). The SQ3R study technique: A forgotten research target. *Journal of Reading, 23,* 705–708.

King, A. (1989). Effects of self-questioning training on college students' comprehension of lectures. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 14,* 366–381.

King, A. (1992). Comparison of self-questioning, summarizing, and notetaking-review as strategies for learning from lectures. *American Educational Research Journal, 29,* 303–323.

Matt, G. E., Pechersky, B., & Cervantes, C. (1991). High- school study habits and early college achievement. *Psychological Reports, 69,* 91–96.

Mayer, R. E. (1988). Learning strategies: An overview. In C. E. Weinstein, E. T. Goetz, & P. A. Alexander (Eds.). *Learning and study strategies: Issues in assessment, instruction, and evaluation* (pp. 11–22). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

McCagg, E. C., & Dansereau, D. F. (1991). A convergent paradigm for examining knowledge mapping as a learning strategy. *Journal of Educational Research, 84,* 317–324.

McCormick, S., & Cooper, J. O. (1991). Can SQ3R facilitate secondary learning disabled students' literal comprehension of expository text? Three experiments. *Reading Psychology, 12,* 239–271.

McGinn, M. K., & Winne, P. H. (1994, April). *Moving from products to processes: A review of feedback in mathematics education.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

McKeachie, W. J. (1988). The need for study strategy training. In C. E. Weinstein, E. T. Goetz, & P. A. Alexander (Eds.). *Learning and study strategies: Issues in assessment, instruction, and evaluation* (pp. 3–9). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Nist, S. L., & Simpson, M. L. (1990). The effects of PLAE upon students' test performance and metacognitive awareness. *Yearbook of the National Reading Conference, 39,* 321–327.

Nist, S. L., Simpson, M. L., Olejnik, S., & Mealey, D. L. (1991). The relation between self-selected study processes and test performance. *American Educational Research Journal, 28,* 849–874.

Pauk, W. (1991). *How to study in college.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Ramsden, P., & Entwistle, N. J. (1981). Effects of academic departments on students' approaches to studying. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 51,* 368–383.

Robinson, F. (1946). *Effective study.* New York: Harper.

Salomon, G., & Perkins, D. N. (1989). Rocky roads to transfer: Rethinking mechanisms of a neglected phenomenon. *Educational Psychologist, 24,* 113–142.

Peterson, S. E. (1992). The cognitive functions of underlining as a study technique. *Reading Research and Instruction, 31,* 49–56.

Ruddell, R. B., & Boyle, O. F. (1989). A study of cognitive mapping as a means to improve summarization and comprehension of expository text. *Reading Research and Instruction, 29,* 12–22.

Schumaker, J. B. (1982). Multipass: A learning strategy for improving reading comprehension. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 5,* 295–304.

Slavin, R. E. (1986). Best-evidence synthesis: An alternative to meta-analytic and traditional reviews. *Educational Researcher, 15* (9), 5–11.

Spires, H. A. (1993). Learning from a lecture: Effects of comprehension monitoring. *Reading Research and Instruction, 32,* 19–30.

Stahl, N. A., Simpson, M. L., & Hayes, C. G. (1992). Ten recommendations from research for teaching high-risk college students. *Journal of Developmental Education, 16,* 2–4, 6, 8, 10.

Winne, P. H. (1985). Steps toward promoting cognitive achievements. *Elementary School Journal, 85,* 673–693.

Winne, P. H. (1992). State-of-the-art instructional computing systems that afford instruction and bootstrap research. In M. Jones & P. H. Winne (Eds.). *Foundations and frontiers of adaptive learning environments* (pp. 349–380). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Winne, P. H. (1995). Inherent details in self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychologist, 30,* 173–187.

Winne, P. H., & Perry, N. (1994). Educational psychology. In V. Ramachandran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (vol. 2, pp. 213–223). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Book Reviews

Faculty at Work: Motivation, Expectation, Satisfaction, by Robert T. Blackburn and Janet H. Lawrence. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995. 296+ pp. $39.95

GERHARD SONNERT, Harvard University

A sense of crisis pervades academe. Critics have accused American faculty, for instance, of tenure-induced laziness, of producing increasingly useless or worthless knowledge, and in extreme cases, of committing outright scientific fraud. In addition, budgetary austerity and a glutted academic labor market have been observed to escalate competition for money and jobs, and to depress morale among faculty members. In this atmosphere of apprehension, it seems timely to take a calm look at the facts about the American faculty at work. Professors Blackburn and Lawrence's solid quantitative research provides a wealth of differentiated information about what faculty members do and why they do it.

Most of the material presented in this volume stems from a large-scale representative survey. Under the authors' direction, questionnaires were collected from 4240 faculty members across the country in 1987 and 1988 by the National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning at the University of Michigan. This major study is commendable for its breadth across institutional settings (spanning from community colleges to the most prestigious research universities), its scope of disciplines (from the humanities to the hard sciences), as well as for its coverage of various facets of faculty work (research, teaching, and service and scholarship).

Blackburn and Lawrence's main question is: What determines faculty members' behavior? Based on the assumption that individual and environmental factors interact in complex ways to shape behavior, the authors develop a theoretical model of how faculty members behave. The model is rooted in motivation theory. It includes sociodemographic characteristics, such as age, gender, and ethnicity; and career variables describing the career path, such as academic discipline, type of academic institution, past and present positions, and career age. These are the "bread and butter" explanatory variables of much of the existing research in this area.

The next two groups of variables are a more unique contribution by the authors. Stressing cognition as the mediator of the interaction process between the individual and the environment, the authors include self-knowledge and social knowledge variables. The area of self-knowledge contains self-perceived beliefs, attitudes, and values, such as one's efficacy as a researcher and one's level of ambition and persistence. Social knowledge indicates how the faculty members perceive the environment, for instance, how supportive one's col-

leagues are of research, and what work activities are valued by the university administration. Finally, there are environmental conditions and environmental responses, as well as social contingencies.

The main thrust of this book is to examine whether the inclusion of self-knowledge and social knowledge variables makes a notable improvement over sociodemographic and career variables in explaining faculty behavior in three key areas — research, teaching, and service and scholarship. To summarize the great mass of highly detailed results: the authors report an impressive validation of their theoretical framework, which in the strongest case (research) explains more than 50 percent of outcome variance, on average. In particular, self-knowledge variables and social knowledge variables were found to be important — more important than the usual sociodemographic and career variables.

Blackburn and Lawrence can therefore claim that their theoretical framework has made a major contribution to our understanding of professors' work. But some things remain to be done in future research that will build on their approach. First, the model needs to be explored more fully. As the authors readily acknowledge, their data did not allow a thorough examination of the role of environmental factors, although it seems crucial to examine how closely they are related to social knowledge. (For example, how well do faculty members recognize the environmental reward structure?) The final validation for including social knowledge in the theoretical framework rests on demonstrating that it improves upon explanations by environmental variables alone. Furthermore, family responsibilities, in my opinion, deserve a more prominent and systematic treatment within the theoretical framework than being included in the residual category of "social contingencies," alongside extended illnesses.

Second, the theoretical framework raises important questions about the causal relationships between the components. For instance, does the professors' belief in their competence as researchers indeed explain their research behavior, or is it the other way around? As the authors point out, *longitudinal* studies are sorely needed to address these questions.

There is also a more general issue about the extent to which approaches of this kind can explain faculty members' behavior. Even while researchers, such as the authors, successfully increase the explanatory power of their theoretical models, changes in the social reality of faculty work itself point in the opposite direction. As broad sociostructural determinants lose their force, idiosyncratic influences — even sheer luck — become more important. This may eventually lower the "ceiling of explainability" for traditional quantitative methodology.

The authors also compare how faculty members and academic administrators view the workplace and each other and give some level-headed advice to both faculty members and administrators. In general, the importance of social knowledge for professors' behavior suggests that it is crucial for administrators to tell faculty members clearly and early what is expected of them and to set appropriate rewards. On the other hand, however, the importance of self-knowledge points to the strength of an intrinsic motivation of what professors do. This autonomy may limit the efficacy of external rewards.

Containing laudably little jargon, the book is accessible to a wider audience.

The extensive and thorough review of relevant theories and research results is useful for those who wish to acquaint themselves with this area. The index, unfortunately, is not ordered alphabetically, but by the authors' theoretical model. Specialists and researchers in this field will appreciate the large amount of tabulated statistical information and the meticulous documentation of research procedures and methodology (see especially the eight appendices). Academic administrators and policy makers receive pragmatic recommendations of how to improve the work situation of faculty members. At the same time, they are alerted to the potential limits of intervention.

This book provides a fascinating look into the multifaceted professional life of faculty members. It is a work of empirical substance as well as a milestone of theoretical conceptualization. The key result is that faculty members' motivation and expectation predict their behavior more strongly than sociodemographic and career variables do. In contrast to pessimistic assessments of the current situation in academe, Blackburn and Lawrence accentuate the positive. They argue that professors produce a lot of high-quality research, even after attaining tenure, and they emphasize that, after all, faculty members still report high levels of satisfaction.

The Research University in a Time of Discontent, edited by
Jonathan R. Cole, Elinor G. Barber, and Stephen R. Graubard.
Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.
ix + 404 pp. $45.00 ($15.95)

EDWARD J. HACKETT, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

The U.S. research university is in crisis, as it has been many times before, but this volume gives us confidence that reports of its imminent demise are greatly exaggerated. Academic life has been unsettled by new government regulations, tight budgets, changing student characteristics, restructured relationships with industry and government, a new politics of knowledge and, most profoundly, a shift in the very principles upon which the university is legitimated. But social institutions are robust and weather most storms, although some organizations will not endure, and most will be changed by the experience. The nineteen essays of this volume explore the character and consequences of such transformative forces, with valuable attention to their historical and institutional contexts, and then suggest strategies of response. While the essays defy simple characterization (which may explain why the book lacks partitions, connective editorial essays, and a comprehensive overview), there are a handful of recurrent themes that lend coherence to the collection.

Jonathan Cole's perceptive meditation on dilemmas of choice sounds a chord that resonates throughout the volume: research universities face paradoxes and must now make consequential decisions that will bestow benefits only at a price. Donald Kennedy pursues this theme in his discussion of universities' reluctance to make necessary choices between one program and an-

other, one initiative and another, one policy and another. For Nannerl Keohane, universities confront tensions between parochial and cosmopolitan affiliations, between tradition and an orientation toward the future, and between learning as an end in itself and as a means to economic, material and social benefits. Stephen Stigler finds it paradoxical that universities, which study and extol the benefits of competition for other sectors of society, are themselves so resistant to competition between programs, departments, disciplines, and even schools.

Also connecting the essays is a historical perspective that guards against uninformed longing for an imagined "golden age" — which probably was not all that lustrous — and prevents those readers who might lack that perspective from looking at the current crisis with a sense of panic, as though academe had never before been troubled, questioned, or financially challenged. Further, several authors tell us precisely what is new and distinctive about the current situation in the research university. Neil Smelser, for example, carefully explains that current concerns about campus diversity and multiculturalism echo similar issues of the past but are distinctive in their collective expression, scope, and focus on entitlement and legitimacy. Stephen Graubard, in the closing chapter, specifies several areas of historical ignorance about the research university in the twentieth century, challenging historians to address these with due attention to the full spectrum of academic institutions — not just the elite — and with sensitivity for the specific political, social and economic forces that have reshaped academe.

A third theme considers how the institution of higher education is positioned within the United States today. John Searle lucidly examines the implications for higher education of ongoing philosophic and polemic arguments about the Western rational tradition. Walter Massey, in contrast, explores four practical challenges confronting the research university: a crowded niche, dependence on federal largesse, the necessity of educating a diverse population of professionals, and financial constraints. Seymour Martin Lipset contributes a brief but spirited appreciation of the research university, while Harvey Brooks tackles head-on eight substantial criticisms that have been leveled against academe (ranging from unresponsiveness to societal needs through technological backwardness to the inefficiencies of the tenure system).

The relationship of the research university to its diverse stakeholders is a fourth theme that weaves through this collection of essays. Kenneth Prewitt reports that even in these skeptical days public opinion treats academe and faculty members rather more kindly than it does other social institutions (e.g., the U.S. Congress). William Richardson and Rodney Nichols, in their separate chapters, examine the scale of academic research activity, the consequences of dependence on federal largesse, and the prospects for a "soft landing" from the decades of high science spending. Each sees significant challenges — such as program integration, community outreach, and internationalization — but they share a qualified optimism about the prospects of self-adjustment.

Students are perhaps the paramount stakeholders in the university, a fact that may become clearer if we would stop calling them "customers" and instead recognize the unique relationship between the university and its students. In making his case for a stronger intellectual and social community on campus, Frank Rhodes reminds us that "undergraduate education is fundamental to the existence of the university: it occupies more time, involves more people,

consumes more resources, requires more facilities, and generates more revenue than any other activity" (p. 181). To do better in this endeavor, Adrienne Jamieson and Nelson Polsby outline a novel program that allows undergraduates to conduct meaningful social science research as part of their coursework.

Francis Sutton places the U.S. system of higher education in comparative framework, seeking contextual forces that have led to its preeminence and assessing the prospects for sustained excellence in a more tightly coupled world. Continuing this line of exploration, Eugene Skolnikoff first discusses the relationship between universities and the nation, then considers the challenges posed to both by an internationalized curriculum, economic competition, and a rising population of foreign-born students. "As we move into the twenty-first century," Skolnikoff warns, "the international roles of the American research universities in both education and research are likely to be (or ought to be) more important to both the nation and the world than they have been in the latter half of the twentieth century" (p. 356). To "move from the parochial attitudes that are still prevalent . . . university administrators have to demonstrate the will to commit scarce resources, to overrule other initiatives that ignore, neglect, or conflict with goals of internationalization" (p. 357).

"Where are the great university presidents of today?" Steven Muller asks at the outset of his chapter (p. 115), and the question is most apt today as the challenges mount while the president's role shrinks to that of mendicant, publicist, and shill. His answer is circumspect and considered, identifying four structural forces that have altered the president's role. Great presidents are at work even today, he seems to say, but their offices have shrunk. Addressing the general issue of academic governance, Robert Rosenzweig agrees with Muller that changes in the structure of academe and its social context have combined to complicate campus leadership and impede decision making.

Excellent as these essays are, I would have welcomed more data about students, faculty, and universities in support of the arguments. Excellent national time series of indicators are available to illustrate the trends and transformations of concern here, and many of these have been published and would only need to be restructured into charts and tables.

The core of this volume grew out of meetings held in the early 1990s under the aegis of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and reported in the fall 1993 issue of Daedalus. Nine additional essays were prepared especially for this book, resulting in a nineteen-chapter compendium authored by an elite group of academic leaders and scholars. Indeed, the assemblage is almost too distinguished, for the authors have so much at stake and such a wealth of tact and polish that they pull some punches, gloss some critical issues, and let pass the opportunity for a thoroughgoing reexamination of the research university in the contemporary United States. In this they are meliorists and incrementalists of the best sort, indicating the paths to improvement at the margin. Contributions from scholars now engaged in critical and empirical examinations of the research university — you know who you are — would have lent a welcome edge, bite and attitude to this well-mannered collection.

Annual Index

Vol. 67, Numbers 1–6 (1996)

1–118 ..... January/February
119–242 ..... March/April
243–366 ..... May/June
367–482 ..... July/August
483–601 ..... September/October
603–724 ..... November/December

Academic Libraries: Their Rationale and Role in American Higher Education, Gerard B. McCabe and Ruth J. Person (eds.), reviewed, 67:4, 481–82

Action Research into the Quality of Student Learning: A Paradigm for Faculty Development, David Kember and Jan McKay, 67:5, 528–54

Aguinis, Herman, Mitchell S. Nesler, Brian M. Quigley, Suk-Jae Lee, and James T. Tedeschi, Power Bases of Faculty Supervisors and Educational Outcomes for Graduate Students, 67:3, 267–97

Alternative Definition of Quality of Undergraduate College Education, An: Toward Usable Knowledge for Improvement, Robert C. Nordvall and John M. Braxton, 67:5, 483–97

American Higher Education: A History, Christopher J. Lucas, reviewed, 67:5, 597–98

Annual Index, 67:6, 721–24

Banta, Trudy W., Linda B. Rudolph, Janice Van Dyke, and Homer S. Fisher, Performance Funding Comes of Age in Tennessee, 67:1, 23–45

Bayer, Alan E., *see* Braxton, John M.

Bell, Stephen, University-Industry Interaction in the Ontario Centres of Excellence, 67:3, 322–48

Benin, Mary, *see* Okun, Morris A.

Betrayed by the Academy: The Sexual Harassment of Women College Faculty, Eric L. Dey, Jessica S. Korn, and Linda J. Sax, 67:2, 149–73

Blackburn, Robert T., and Janet H. Lawrence, *Faculty at Work: Motivation, Expectation, Satisfaction,* reviewed, 67:6, 716–18

—— *see* Tien, Flora F.

Brandt-Williams, Ann, *see* Okun, Morris A.

Braxton, John M., book review, 67:1, 115–18

—— *see* Nordvall, Robert C.

Braxton, John M., Mardy T. Eimers, and Alan E. Bayer, The Implications of Teaching Norms for the Improvement of Undergraduate Education, 67:6, 603–25

Bringle, Robert G., and Julie A. Hatcher, Implementing Service Learning in Higher Education, 67:2, 221–39

Brown, Philip, and Richard Scase, *Higher Education and Corporate Realities: Class, Culture, and the Decline of Graduate Careers,* reviewed, 67:5, 599–601

Cabal, Alfonso Borrero, *The University as an Institution Today,* reviewed, 67:4, 476–78

Cabrera, Alberto F., *see* Nora, Amaury

Calculus of Intimacy, The: A Teaching Life, Richard J. Murphy, Jr., reviewed, 67:2, 240–41

Cole, Jonathan R., Elinor G. Barber, and Stephen R. Graubard (eds.), *The Research University in a Time of Discontent,* reviewed, 67:6, 718–20

Contradictory College, The: The Conflicting Origins, Impacts, and Futures of the Community College, Kevin J. Dougherty, reviewed, 67:3, 359–64

Dalton, Margaret M., *see* Stewart, Kenneth D.

Damrosch, David, *We Scholars: Changing the Culture of the University,* reviewed, 67:2, 241–42

Development of Salary Goal Modeling, The: From Regression Analysis to a Value-Based Prescriptive Approach, Kenneth D. Stewart, Margaret M. Dalton, Geri A. Dino, and Steven P. Wilkinson, 67:5, 555–76

Dey, Eric L., Jessica S. Korn, and Linda J. Sax, Betrayed by the Academy: The Sexual Harassment of Women College Faculty, 67:2, 149–73

Dino, Geri A., *see* Stewart, Kenneth D.

Discussion in the College Classroom: Triangulating Observational and Survey Results, Claudia E. Nunn, 67:3, 243–66

Dougherty, Kevin J., *The Contradictory College: The Conflicting Origins, Impacts, and Futures of the Community College*, reviewed, 67:3, 359–64

Eaton, Judith S., *Strengthening Collegiate Education in Community Colleges*, reviewed, 67:4, 478–81

Economics or Education: The Establishment of American Land-Grant Universities, Scott Key, 67:2, 196–220

Edison, Marcia, *see* Pascarella, Ernest T.

Eimers, Mardy T., *see* Braxton, John M.

Faculty at Work: Motivation, Expectation, Satisfaction, Robert T. Blackburn and Janet H. Lawrence, reviewed, 67:6, 716–18

Faculty Rank System, Research Motivation, and Faculty Research Productivity: Measure Refinement and Theory Testing, Flora F. Tien and Robert T. Blackburn, 67:1, 2–22

Finnegan, Dorothy, book review, 67:2, 240–41

First Encounters of the Bureaucratic Kind: Early Freshman Experiences with a Campus Bureaucracy, Glen J. Godwin and William T. Markham, 67:6, 660–91

Fisher, Homer S., *see* Banta, Trudy W.

Godwin, Glen J., and William T. Markham, First Encounters of the Bureaucratic Kind: Early Freshman Experiences with a Campus Bureaucracy, 67:6, 660–91

Hackett, Edward J., book review, 67:6, 718–20

Hadwin, Allyson Fiona, and Philip H. Winne, Study Strategies Have Meager Support: A Review with Recommendations for Implementation, 67:6, 692–715

Hagedorn, Linda Serra, *see* Pascarella, Ernest T.

Hannah, Susan B., The Higher Education Act of 1992: Skills, Constraints, and the Politics of Higher Education, 67:5, 498–527

Hatcher, Julie A., *see* Bringle, Robert G.

Heywood, John S., book review, 67:5, 599–601

Higher Education Act of 1992, The: Skills, Constraints, and the Politics of Higher Education, Susan B. Hannah, 67:5, 498–527

Higher Education and Corporate Realities: Class, Culture, and the Decline of Graduate Careers, Philip Brown and Richard Scase, reviewed, 67:5, 599–601

Implementing Service Learning in Higher Education, Robert G. Bringle and Julie A. Hatcher, 67:2, 221–39

Implications of Teaching Norms for the Improvement of Undergraduate Education, The, John M. Braxton, Mardy T. Eimers, and Alan E. Bayer, 67:6, 603–25

Influences on Students' Openness to Diversity and Challenge in the First Year of College, Ernest T. Pascarella, Marcia Edison, Amaury Nora, Linda Serra Hagedorn, and Patrick T. Terenzini, 67:2, 174–95

In-Migration of College Students to the State of New York, Wonseon Kyung, 67:3, 349–58

Invisible Scholars: College Students with Learning Disabilities, Frances K. Stage and Nancy V. Milne, 67:4, 426–45

Kaplin, William A., and Barbara A. Lee, *The Law of Higher Education: A Comprehensive Guide to Legal Implications of Administrative Decision Making*, reviewed, 67:3, 365–66

Kember, David, and Jan McKay, Action Research into the Quality of Student Learning: A Paradigm for Faculty Development, 67:5, 528–54

Key, Scott, Economics or Education: The Establishment of American Land-Grant Universities, 67:2, 196–220

Korn, Jessica S., *see* Dey, Eric L.

Kyung, Wonseon, In-Migration of College Students to the State of New York, 67:3, 349–58

Law of Higher Education, The: A Comprehensive Guide to Legal Implications of Administrative Decision Making, William A. Kaplin and Barbara A. Lee, reviewed, 67:3, 365–66

Lee, Suk-Jae, *see* Aguinis, Herman

Levin, Robin (ed.), *Research Ethics: Cases and Materials*, reviewed, 67:1, 115–18

Lewis, W. Cris, Retirement Wealth, Income, and Decision Making in Higher Education, 67:1, 85–102

Lin, Yangjing, and W. Paul Vogt, Occupational Outcomes for Students Earning Two-Year College Degrees: Income, Status, and Equity, 67:4, 446–75

Lucas, Christopher J., *American Higher Education: A History*, reviewed, 67:5, 597–98

Markham, William T., *see* Godwin, Glen J.

McCabe, Gerard B., and Ruth J. Person (eds.), *Academic Libraries: Their Rationale and Role in American Higher Education*, reviewed, 67:4, 481–82

McKay, Jan, *see* Kember, David

Meeting the Demand for Higher Education Without Breaking the Bank: A Framework for the Design of State Higher Education Policies for an Era of Increasing Demand, William Zumeta, 67:4, 367–425

Milne, Nancy V., *see* Stage, Frances K.

Mitchell, Brad L., book review, 67:2, 241–42
Murphy, Richard J., Jr., *The Calculus of Intimacy: A Teaching Life*, reviewed, 67:2, 240–41

Nesler, Mitchell S., *see* Aguinis, Herman
Nnazor, Reginald, book review, 67:4, 476–78
Nora, Amaury, *see* Pascarella, Ernest T.
Nora, Amaury, and Alberto F. Cabrera, The Role of Perceptions of Prejudice and Discrimination on the Adjustment of Minority Students to College, 67:2, 119–48
Nordvall, Robert C., and John M. Braxton, An Alternative Definition of Quality of Undergraduate College Education: Toward Usable Knowledge for Improvement, 67:5, 483–97
Nunn, Claudia E., Discussion in the College Classroom: Triangulating Observational and Survey Results, 67:3, 243–66

Occupational Outcomes for Students Earning Two-Year College Degrees: Income, Status, and Equity, Yangjing Lin and W. Paul Vogt, 67:4, 445–75
Okun, Morris A., Mary Benin, and Ann Brandt-Williams, Staying in College: Moderators of the Relation between Intention and Institutional Departure, 67:5, 577–96
Olivas, Michael A., book review, 67:3, 365–66
Oromaner, Mark, book review, 67:4, 478–81

Park, Shelley M., Research, Teaching, and Service: Why Shouldn't Women's Work Count? 67:1, 46–84
Pascarella, Ernest T., Marcia Edison, Amaury Nora, Linda Serra Hagedorn, and Patrick T. Terenzini, Influences on Students' Openness to Diversity and Challenge in the First Year of College, 67:2, 174–95
Performance Funding Comes of Age in Tennessee, Trudy W. Banta, Linda B. Rudolph, Janice Van Dyke, and Homer S. Fisher, 67:1, 23–45
Perkin, Harold, book review, 67:5, 597–98
Power Bases of Faculty Supervisors and Educational Outcomes for Graduate Students, Herman Aguinis, Mitchell S. Nesler, Brian M. Quigley, Suk-Jae Lee, and James T. Tedeschi, 67:3, 267–97

Quigley, Brian M., *see* Aguinis, Herman

Reorganizing the Faculty Workforce for Flexibility: Part-Time Professional Labor, Gary Rhoades, 67:6, 626–59
Research Ethics: Cases and Materials, Robin Levin (ed.), reviewed, 67:1, 115–18
Research, Teaching, and Service: Why Shouldn't Women's Work Count? Shelley M. Park, 67:1, 46–84
Research University in a Time of Discontent, The, Jonathan R. Cole, Elinor G. Barber, and Stephen R. Graubard (eds.), reviewed, 67:6, 718–20
Retirement Wealth, Income, and Decision Making in Higher Education, W. Cris Lewis, 67:1, 85–102
Rhoades, Gary, Reorganizing the Faculty Workforce for Flexibility: Part-Time Professional Labor, 67:6, 626–59
Role of Perceptions of Prejudice and Discrimination on the Adjustment of Minority Students to College, The, Amaury Nora and Alberto F. Cabrera, 67:2, 119–48
Rudolph, Linda B., *see* Banta, Trudy W.

Sax, Linda J., *see* Dey, Eric L.
Shepherd, Gary, *see* Shepherd, Gordon
Shepherd, Gordon, and Gary Shepherd, War Attitudes and Ideological Orientations of Honors Directors in American Higher Education, 67:3, 298–321
Social Process Skills and Career Achievement among Male and Female Academics, Latika Vasil, 67:1, 103–14
Sonnert, Gerhard, book review, 67:6, 716–18
Stage, Frances K., and Nancy V. Milne, Invisible Scholars: College Students with Learning Disabilities, 67:4, 426–45
Staying in College: Moderators of the Relation between Intention and Institutional Departure, Morris A. Okun, Mary Benin, and Ann Brandt-Williams, 67:5, 577–96
Stewart, Kenneth D., Margaret M. Dalton, Geri A. Dino, and Steven P. Wilkinson, The Development of Salary Goal Modeling: From Regression Analysis to a Value-Based Prescriptive Approach, 67:5, 555–76
Strengthening Collegiate Education in Community Colleges, Judith S. Eaton, reviewed, 67:4, 478–81
Study Strategies Have Meager Support: A Review with Recommendations for Implementation, Allyson Fiona Hadwin and Philip H. Winne, 67:6, 692–715

Tedeschi, James T., *see* Aguinis, Herman
Terenzini, Patrick T., *see* Pascarella, Ernest T.
Tien, Flora F., and Robert T. Blackburn, Faculty Rank System, Research Motivation, and Faculty Research Productivity: Measure Refinement and Theory Testing, 67:1, 2–22
Townsend, Barbara K., review essay, 67:3, 359–64

University as an Institution Today, The, Alfonso Borrero Cabal, reviewed, 67:4, 476–78

University-Industry Interaction in the Ontario Centres of Excellence, Stephen Bell, 67:3, 322–48

Van Dyke, Janice, *see* Banta, Trudy W.

Vasil, Latika, Social Process Skills and Career Achievement among Male and Female Academics, 67:1, 103–14

Vogt, W. Paul, *see* Lin, Yanjing

War Attitudes and Ideological Orientations of Honors Directors in American Higher Education, Gordon Shepherd and Gary Shepherd, 67:3, 298–321

We Scholars: Changing the Culture of the University, David Damrosch, reviewed, 67:2, 241–42

Whitmire, Ethelene, book review, 67:4, 481–82

Wilkinson, Steven P., *see* Stewart, Kenneth D.

Winne, Philip H., *see* Hadwin, Allyson Fiona

Zumeta, William, Meeting the Demand for Higher Education Without Breaking the Bank: A Framework for the Design of State Higher Education Policies for an Era of Increasing Demand, 67:4, 367–425

Now Published by
The Johns Hopkins University Press

THE REVIEW OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Philip Altbach, Editor

The official journal of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE), *The Review of Higher Education* provides a forum for discussion of issues affecting higher education and related fields. The journal advances the study of colleges and universities by publishing peer-reviewed articles, essays, reviews, and research findings. Its broad approach emphasizes systematic inquiry and practical implications. Considered one of the leading research journals in the field, *The Review* keeps scholars, academic leaders, and public policy makers abreast of critical issues facing higher education today.

Recent articles include "What Is Going on in Higher Education? Is it Time for a Change?" by Judith Dozier Hackman, and "Preparing for the New Professoriate: The Doctor of Arts Revised," by Kirby L. Koriath and Margaret M. Merrion.

✦

Published quarterly
for the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) in September, December, March, and June.

Annual Membership to ASHE: $70.00, individuals; $55.00, students/emeritus (includes subscription to *The Review of Higher Education*, the quarterly *ASHE Newletter*, the annual conference; discounts on the *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report Series*, the annual *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, and the *ASHE Reader Series*). For information on joining ASHE, please call the Johns Hopkins University Press at 1-800-547-1784.

Annual Subscriptions— Volume 20 (1996-1997): $55.00, individuals; $90.00, institutions.

To order your subscription by MasterCard or Visa, **call toll-free 1-800-547-1784.**
Or send check or money order drawn on U.S. bank in U.S. dollars, payable to: The Johns Hopkins University Press, Journals Publishing Division, P.O. Box 19966, Baltimore, MD 21211-0966.

EA-6

The Rise of American Research Universities

HUGH DAVIS GRAHAM AND NANCY DIAMOND

Graham and Diamond provide a fresh interpretation that emphasizes distinctive attributes of American higher education—decentralized administration, a large and pluralistic market of public and private institutions, and intense competition for students, faculty, and research funding. By combining historical analysis and quantitative comparisons, they confirm the excellence of many traditional elites while offering surprising—and occasionally startling—evidence of successful new challengers.

$39.95 hardcover

Games Colleges Play

Scandal and Reform in Intercollegiate Athletics

JOHN R. THELIN

"An important historical analysis of college sport placed in the broader setting of American higher education. Thelin provides a helpful, if dispiriting, perspective for not only thinking about current problems plaguing college sport but also for understanding why college sport has survived and why university leadership and the sports establishment have resisted major reform efforts."—*Academe*

$15.95 paperback

Teaching Well and Liking It

Motivating Faculty to Teach Effectively

EDITED BY JAMES L. BESS

What makes someone a good teacher? And why are some persons more strongly motivated to teach effectively than others? A distinguished group of scholars offers a sophisticated and stimulating look at the issues involved in motivating educators to teach well in the challenging environment of the modern university.

$39.95 hardcover

Investment in Learning

The Individual and Social Value of American Higher Education

HOWARD R. BOWEN

with the collaboration of Peter Clecak, Jacqueline Powers Doud, and Gordon K. Douglass

including a new introduction by Michael S. McPherson and Morton Owen Schapiro

"Decades after initial publication, *Investment in Learning* remains a classic contribution to our understanding of the complex ways in which higher education contributes individually and socially."—from the introduction by Michael S. McPherson, President, Macalester College, and Morton Owen Schapiro, Dean of the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences, University of Southern California

$22.95 paperback

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY PRESS

Hampden Station, Baltimore, Maryland 21211

1-800-537-5487 • http://jhupress.jhu.edu/home.html

This issue:

The Implications of Teaching Norms for the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
John M. Braxton, Mardy T. Eimers, and Alan E. Bayer

Reorganizing the Faculty Workforce for Flexibility: Part-Time Professional Labor
Gary Rhoades

First Encounters of the Bureaucratic Kind: Early Freshman Experiences with a Campus Bureaucracy
Glen J. Godwin and William T. Markham

Study Strategies Have Meager Support: A Review with Recommendations for Implementation
Allyson Fiona Hadwin and Philip H. Winne

Cover: Around the Verne, Larry Hamill

JHE *A publication of the Ohio State University Press* *ISSN 0022-154*